

Robert V. Canosa, Jr.  
Earle W. Carder, Jr.  
Herbert W. Carr  
Robert V. Cauchon  
Joseph R. Childers  
Frederic J. Clawson  
Robert J. Cleary  
Robert W. Cohan  
Thomas A. Connor  
Frederick D. Cook  
Wayne H. Crawford, Jr.  
Harold W. Crozier  
John D. Cumalat  
John E. Cummings  
William E. Cunningham  
William S. Currie  
Richard J. Dermody  
Richard A. Derus  
Eugene A. Dieckert, Jr.  
Joseph E. Dierkes  
Donald L. Dondero  
Robert M. Ducey  
Harry B. Ellis  
James E. Empting  
David L. English  
William Evans  
James V. Farley, Jr.  
Doc G. Faulkner, Jr.  
Robert Fedor  
John J. Fickers  
Albert O. Floyd  
Archie E. Floyd  
Isaac N. Franklin, Jr.  
John McA. Frye  
Peter Galimitakis  
Joseph J. Garside  
Gene P. Gauthier  
Michael Gaydos, Jr.  
George W. Gibson  
Robert P. Graves  
William D. Greene  
Galen M. Hallett, Jr.  
Charles R. Hannun  
Andrew U. Hassman, Jr.  
Millard F. Havener  
Kenneth G. Haynes  
Richard W. Haupt  
Robert L. Heinz  
Richard M. Hennigan  
William McG. Hepburn, Jr.  
Harold M. Hewell  
Alvin S. Hibbs  
Robert K. Hoffman  
Carl L. Hokenson, Jr.  
Philip C. Holland  
Wallace J. L. Houde  
Lewis McN. Hough  
Richard H. Howe  
George E. Hubbell  
Ira J. Hudson 3d  
Bruce M. Jacobs  
William E. James  
Robert W. Johnson  
William N. Johnson  
Charles W. Jones  
Robert A. Keagy  
James D. Kearny  
Edward T. Keating  
Owen K. King  
Joseph M. Kitchen  
John L. Kline, Jr.  
Robert H. Koehler  
Robert P. Kolar  
Lee F. Kyle  
Eugene Lange  
Charles S. Leach  
Morris Levin

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947:

William E. Ainslie  
Michael Bat  
James M. Baumgardner  
Carl I. Bergkvist  
Robert M. Bonk  
Duane D. Borgert  
William H. Brownell  
Wright A. Burnham  
Ralph A. Buswell

Ervin H. Cooper  
Howard R. Cottrell  
Paul R. Ebling  
Richard B. Euchenhofer  
Malcolm E. Graham  
Normal A. Henry  
James D. Hereford, Jr.  
Leif A. Houkom  
Raymond E. Jeffery  
Carroll R. Keyser  
"J" Scott Kirkwood  
John W. Kline  
Francis A. Kocourek  
Donald H. Lake  
John R. Logan  
Donald E. Mackin  
Donald S. Macoy  
Joseph L. Mahoney, Jr.  
William F. Mangan  
Noel D. Martin  
Alfred S. Maurstad  
Harold A. McCauley  
Thomas T. McGinnis  
David E. Moline  
Robert F. Morison  
Maurice A. Notch  
Thomas O. Nutt, Jr.  
Joseph F. Ouellette  
Paul J. Pfeiffer  
Charles R. Pitchford  
Raymond Ramer  
Robert L. Reed  
Keith L. Robinett  
Edward A. Short  
John T. Snyder  
Samuel S. Stephens  
Jackson R. Strange  
Lawrence E. Sutherland, Jr.  
Edward J. Tuite  
William S. Waldron  
Carleton R. Williams

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947:  
Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.  
Henry F. Peger  
Maurice A. Person  
Donald R. Williams  
James L. Yates

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Jehovah God, we would heed Thy holy word and in all our ways acknowledge Thee, and Thou wilt direct our paths. We thank Thee that the ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace. O may our souls burst in gratitude and praise before the purpose and the abundance of our God. Take our powers unemployed, our ideals unfulfilled, and our possibilities unachieved and use them for the promotion of Thy kingdom; so shall we find favor in the sight of God and man. Every noble task completed enlarges the soul of the doer and increases the blessings of peace and contentment for our country. As selected servants and leaders of the people, may we carry their needs in our hearts and be very, very sure that we live to serve them. We pray in the name of Him who carried our needs to the cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 25, 1947, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of State.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Federal Works Agency.

6. National Archives.

7. Railroad Retirement Board.

8. United States District Court (eastern district of North Carolina).

### PROCUREMENT OF BUILDINGS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 196 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$40,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### INVESTIGATION OF PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to publicity and propaganda in the Government departments and agencies authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$26,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 118

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118 of the Eightieth Congress incurred by the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and provided for by House Resolution 135 of the Eightieth Congress, shall be effective from February 13, 1947.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# **SURVEY OF PROFIT SHARING AND POSSIBILITIES OF INCENTIVE TAXATION**

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report 610, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, being the report entitled "Survey of Experience in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation," which was printed as a report from a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance, acting pursuant to Senate Resolution 215, Seventy-fifth Congress, agreed to May 18, 1938. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## **EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. LODGE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the National Petroleum Commission.

## **GREEK-TURKISH LOAN**

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, some of the criticisms which have been made by those who oppose the proposed legislation authorizing aid to Greece and Turkey have centered around the Greek elections. It has been stated by certain individuals that there have been no registrations for elections in Greece since 1932 and that no one not registered had been permitted to vote in the plebiscite held for the purpose of restoring the monarchy.

In order to ascertain the facts in this connection, I communicated with the Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, regarding the registrations in Greece.

I suppose that it is quite normal that people who are not registered should not be able to vote. This is the case in our own country.

I am putting this letter in the RECORD because I think it important that as much information as possible should be made available to the Congress before they are called upon to vote on this portentous issue. The letter follows:

The statements reported by Mr. Hubert E. Page in the letter which you transmitted to me on April 4, 1947, regarding registration in Greece are not in accordance with the facts.

In preparation for the elections in Greece which were held on March 31, 1946, the period from July 1945 to February 10, 1946, was set aside for registration of voters. Greek citizens were given another opportunity to register from June 3, 1946 to July 12, 1946, in preparation for the plebiscite held

on September 1. Special provision was made for refugees from western Thrace and Macedonia who could not meet the residence qualification. According to the law of April 30, 1946, all electoral lists which had merely been revised and not newly compiled for the elections in March 1946 were required to be compiled anew for the plebiscite. At the request of the Greek Government, an Allied mission observed this undertaking, watching the operation of the registration machinery and analyzing the lists on the completion of the revision and recompilation. The mission expressed itself satisfied that the revision and recompilation of the electoral lists attained a degree of fairness and accuracy which justified their use in seeking the opinion of the Greek people in matters of national import.

## **PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE**

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## **EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Governor Carlson of Kansas at a recent meeting of the Republican National Committee in Kansas City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received permission to include a statement adopted by the forty-fourth annual meeting of the delegates of the American Automobile Association at San Francisco. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing, that it will take about three and one-half pages of the RECORD and cost approximately \$248. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein articles from newspapers concerning the new Surgeon General of the Army.

## **AMUSEMENT TAX ON SCHOOL BENEFITS**

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Mrs. Eunice Hauk, president of the Band Benefit Club of Cassville, Wis., stating that at the request of the local Band Benefit Club she was writing to me to protest the Federal amusement tax as applied to proceeds from school activities. She states:

It would seem to us that this tax is actually levied against public education, since all proceeds from school performances are spent for educational purposes.

This is a subject that has been on my mind a long time, Mr. Speaker. If the Lions Club, for instance, wants to put on a benefit to do something to aid the blind, if the Kiwanis Club wants to do something to aid underprivileged children, if the Rotary Club wants to put on a drive to aid in suppressing subversive activities, or if any fraternal organization wants to do something for patriotic purposes, or sponsor a benefit for world peace, or a home for the aged, or other worthy cause, or if the band mothers or the parent-teacher associations or the 4-H Clubs want to do something for their boys and girls, they have to pay an amusement tax on any admission fee or charge for this benefit. I am therefore referring this matter to the Ways and Means Committee to do something about it, because such organizations should not have to pay a tax in these cases.

## **THE LATE MRS. EVALYN WALSH McLEAN**

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein certain editorials and newspaper comment about Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there passed away, and the world lost, a very great lady, a very great American, Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean. She died at Friendship, a house well named, because those of us who knew her and loved her realized that there could not be a greater friend, a greater philanthropist, one who was more kind.

I wish to speak especially, though, of her friendship, her help to the disabled veterans. She fought to secure for them better houses, better living conditions, better medical services. She herself paid for many things for the disabled veterans. She did what she could to restore sight to the blind; she tried to get the best surgeons, the best drugs, and the best prosthetic appliances for them. No request from a veteran went unheeded. She made her home their home, and I know they mourn her as I do.

## **PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE**

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PRICE TRENDS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, press and radio report a trend toward lower prices, following the forthright statement by the President April 21.

I hope this represents a real willingness all along the line to be satisfied with reasonable prices, margins, and profits.

I hope it represents a turning away, even at this late date, from the reckless inflationary course which has already dangerously decreased the purchasing power of wage and salary earners and fixed-income people, including disabled veterans and those taking GI training.

If it does, we will have stopped at the edge of the abyss, at the edge of a deflationary collapse. Such a collapse, even if only a recession, might have caused unemployment to increase to four, five, or six million before the end of 1947, according to some economists.

Mr. President, it is with satisfaction and pride that I point out that this whole Nation-wide concern about high prices, about the high cost of living, was given sharp focus by the remarks of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. Douglas], made on the floor of this House on March 13. I remember how she brought into the Chamber a housewife's market basket of common food items needed by every family and showed, item by item, how prices had increased since the end of effective price control June 30, last.

The gentlewoman from California, and the housewives of the Nation—if I may be pardoned for pointing—deserve recognition and credit for the part they have played by word and by cautious buying in checking run-away inflation before it is too late. They have helped to bring to their senses those who, for short-run profits, were pursuing a course that would have taken the American people over the same old tragic road of boom and bust. I think my colleague from California is entitled to a vote of thanks from the House and the American people for the timely and dramatic warning she gave to all of us.

And, may I add, the merchants of Newburyport, Mass., are to be commended for showing the same daring imagination in trade that their predecessors displayed when they built, equipped, and sent the clipper ships to the China seas and spread our commerce over the seven seas.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, the resources of democracy to save itself and its people are not exhausted. In the emergency, we find ways to save ourselves from drifting over the falls to final disaster. So it must always be.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a resolution.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an article from the New York Sun.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement from a special committee in his congressional district on appreciation for the program for restoration of our soil which has lifted our farm population from the depths of bankruptcy to a higher level of prosperity and has given assurance of a secure and sound agriculture for future generations, also to include "History of AAA" and "Why the AAA."

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include a letter he received from the Polish-American Congress and in the other to include an article.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an address by Magistrate Maurice Simmons, past national commander, United Spanish War Veterans at Ulysses S. Grant birthday anniversary services, Grant's Tomb, New York City, on April 27, 1947.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include certain resolutions adopted by an American Legion post in his district.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article appearing in the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a broadcast by George E. Reedy.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter which I received from the Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Sunday Star.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record concerning a bill he is introducing today.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, we should always give credit where credit is due. Apparently the War Department is one department of the executive branch of the Government which is making a sincere attempt to cooperate with the Congress in an effort to reduce the number and expense of highly paid civilian personnel. I was gratified to read in the morning paper that the Under Secretary of War has directed the various bureau chiefs to recommend the elimination or demotion of at least 50 percent of the middle and top grade civilians. The bureau chiefs came back with their recommendations affecting only 20 percent in these grades. The Under Secretary, however, stood his ground and insisted that his original directive be carried out.

The number of military personnel is drastically reduced and reductions in grade are made right and left following the termination of active hostilities. There is no reason why the same should not apply to those acting in a civilian capacity.

This same article, however, written by a spokesman for the civil-service employees, charges the War Department with "trickery" in an attempt to make the demotions stick. He goes on to explain that new "job descriptions" are going to justify lower grades although many of the employees will do the same work as they are now doing.

Any of us who have had any intimate experience with Government departments know that this same device, which was never characterized as "trickery" when it worked the other way, was used to up-grade these employees and that it was done with the wholehearted approval and cooperation of the civil-service people. If you wanted to get a civilian promoted it was not possible to do so by simply showing that he or she was doing outstandingly good work, as is the case in ordinary civilian pursuits, but it was necessary to prepare a new "job description" which was done time and time again.

The promoted individual would do exactly the same work today as yesterday but under a different job description, which was the stock method of bringing about a promotion.

It does not lie in the mouth of those who enjoyed the benefits of this system now to complain when it works the other way. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRK-

SEN] chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

**AUTHORIZING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME**

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 40 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 736, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, so there will be no misunderstanding, I am not sponsoring the adoption of Senate bill 736. So that you may know—and I am sure all of you are up to date on it—I wish to call your attention to the fact that we considered the substance of this bit of legislation on February 24, 1947, when the original bill introduced by the chairman of the House District Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for the granting of daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia, was before the House. As all of you will recall, that bill was defeated by a roll-call vote of 210 to 124. During the period of that debate the situation was pretty well discussed, except that we now come back with a bill wherein the power is given to the District Commissioners to decide whether or not we should have daylight-saving time here.

Mr. Chairman, some 3 years ago I asked the minority leader, now the Speaker, to be placed upon the Committee on the District of Columbia because I felt rather sympathetic to some of the problems the District had. However, may I say that, as a Member of Congress, I live here and I am subjected to the conditions that are written in by the Congress. The conditions under which all of us live are as much applicable to me as to anybody else.

May I say at the outset that, regardless of how much criticism I may take, I just do not like the daylight-saving bill. I am against it, I have been against it, and I shall continue to be against the thrusting of daylight-saving time on the people of the District of Columbia, whether it be by direct action of the Congress or rather

by the subtle attempts which are being made today to authorize the District Commissioners to give daylight-saving time to us if they decide in their wisdom to do so. I called your attention before to the fact that all of us are living here by reason of the fact that we are Members of Congress. We live here under the conditions existing, whatever they may be. I think the Members of Congress—certainly the Members of the House—have been very considerate of the District of Columbia and its problems. I happen to be one of those who, in the fight last year for the hospital situation, with the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], prevailed upon the House to go along upon the hospital program and upon many other bills of benefit to the District.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of daylight-saving time has been before the Congress on other occasions. In January 1942, at the request of the President, we passed a daylight-saving bill under the theory and guise that it would permit a saving of electricity and would be in the national interest in carrying on the war. There has never been a single other bill during my years of service in this House that has aroused as much criticism and concern as that bill. As early as 1943 repealer legislation was introduced. I happened to dig up my old daylight-saving file Saturday when I was thinking about this matter, and I find that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, in September of 1945, we repealed that legislation—the first wartime legislation that was repealed. How many different Members of Congress had introduced bills or resolutions or amendments for that purpose? Some 55 in that session.

In the report upon the repeal of that legislation, and I am speaking now of House Report No. 945 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, you will find that there were 16 Members of Congress who introduced concurrent resolutions directly requesting repeal of that legislation, that there were 14 bills which sought to repeal it, and one joint resolution. The other bills, the difference between the 31 and 55, were bills amending that act. So I think the subject of daylight saving time has been pretty much discussed nationally during its trial run of some 3½ years, and it certainly created more unhappiness than any other single piece of wartime legislation that was passed.

Now let me call your attention to another thing. We had no hearings upon this legislation, and I believe there was none in the Senate. Some references have been made to the report of this or that organization that is for it or against it. I do not know how many people were asked to vote upon that or whether it was the usual club meeting, and three or four of the boys said, "Well, I see daylight saving is up, I believe it would help me play golf, so let us write up and tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that our group is for daylight saving time."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. REES. I was called by telephone by one of the employees in one of the

Government agencies a few days ago. This person said, "I was asked to vote as to whether I was in favor of daylight-saving time." She said, "Well, I voted 'no'." Then, she said, "They came back in a few days and rechecked to see if I had changed my mind." Her reason for calling me was to say, "We hope they get this thing out of the way. They are using up a lot of time somewhere in one of these Government agencies figuring out whether or not these people are in favor of it or against it." She said she thought the House had decided this thing several days ago.

Mr. O'HARA. I think that is true. May I point out in the matter of recreation that the Government employees under the 40-hour week have Saturdays off which is more than most of us have off. In the summertime the stores are closed on some days in the middle of the week so that the employees have their recreation and can get out in the sunshine and some of the people who are particularly interested in promoting this are in a position to take off whatever time they want.

Mr. REES. They certainly are.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the gentleman if by contrast this is not true—that the men who produce the food consumed in the District of Columbia and who are not consulted concerning this legislation and never can be consulted, do not get any time off?

Mr. O'HARA. That situation just makes more apparent the confusion that exists on this matter. The last time this matter was up for consideration it was argued that they were going to adopt daylight-saving time in Maryland, I believe. Actually, the localities around Washington have not adopted daylight-saving time, and neither has the surrounding territory in Virginia. I want to point out to you that this will add further to the confusion of your folks back home who will not be aware that there will be another hour's difference in time if we have daylight saving here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the bill calls for hearings by the Commissioners to hear the people of the District as to whether they want daylight-saving time or not. I am sure the gentleman believes in majority rule and if a majority of the citizens of the District do not want daylight-saving time, of course, it would not be granted.

Mr. O'HARA. The answer to that is that you have a few people who come up and say, "Well, we want daylight-saving time." You have a great number of people who say, "Hokey with daylight-saving time. I am not going to bother myself about voting on it." So, we get a small expression of opinion.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it not possible to have a vote in the District and if the majority decide that they want daylight-saving time, then I presume the gentleman would be in favor



of it since it would be what the majority want.

Mr. O'HARA. I am going to exercise my vote right here.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. REES. What about the railroads and airlines? Are they going to change their time schedule?

Mr. O'HARA. No.

Mr. REES. Then people would have to observe the two different times.

Mr. O'HARA. They are not going to change their time. This is an example of the confusion that exists. The radio people are behind this effort to bring daylight-saving time to the District of Columbia. Because in the city of New York, where most of the programs originate, they want to change the time they think the rest of the country ought to bow down and say, "If you gentlemen on the radio want daylight-saving time, the whole country should have daylight-saving time." I do not agree to that.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have under consideration today has been more or less of a thorn in the flesh of the members of the District Committee during the past 2 years. As one member I know we want to get this bill out of the way. We want to find out whether a majority of the Members want daylight saving or want to keep the time as it is.

The bill under consideration today simply gives the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to grant daylight-saving time if a majority of the people in Washington want daylight-saving time. I am not saying whether I want daylight-saving time or not, but if the people of Washington want it I, personally, have no objection to their having it, even though it will affect Members of Congress. I think the Members of the House have been exceptionally fair to the District of Columbia. I know we have done a great deal more for the people of Washington than we have done for the people of South Carolina, which State I have the honor to represent. I think if the people of Washington really wanted daylight-saving time, they should have contacted the Members of Congress who are supposed to take care of legislation for the District of Columbia. I have had three letters relative to daylight saving: one against it and two for it. I do not see very much enthusiasm either way. According to the newspapers, it seems people are contacting the newspapers and asking them to sponsor this legislation. I am of the opinion the only thing for us to do is to take this matter up and dispose of it today once and for all.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, and I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation. I do not know of anything that created quite so much confusion as daylight-saving time during the war. I believe more people in the United States were made

happy over the repeal of the daylight-saving-time legislation than anything that has happened for a long time.

It is said that the people of Washington should regulate their own affairs. I agree with that, provided that when they regulate their own affairs they do not regulate the affairs of others. Many of the farmers adjacent to this territory have to get up now at 4 or half past 4 o'clock in the morning. This means you will get them out of bed between 3 and half past 3 in order to bring the milk and other farm products in to market. What right do the people of the District have to regulate the farmers adjacent to the District, and regulate them in such a way as to impose an undue hardship upon them? Who is behind this legislation, anyway? Is it the Government workers? The Government workers today get out around 4:30. You propose to let them out, under this legislation, at 3:30. In addition to that, the Government workers get a holiday every Saturday and some 45 days in sick and vacation leave. The farmers do not get a holiday on Saturday. They do not get off in the afternoon at 4:30. Now you are trying to make them get up at 3:30 and 4 o'clock in the morning and go to bed before dark if they are to get the proper amount of sleep. You are not treating the farmers who supply the food to the people of this District in the right way, in order to accommodate those who need no further accommodation, in my opinion.

This Government certainly has been generous in dealing with the Government workers. How much more time for recreation, play, and pleasure do they want?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman agree with me that it will take 1 hour of good sleeping time away from the average person who lives in this hot climate in the summertime?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is what you are doing.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman know of any southern city, unless we classify Baltimore as southern, that has daylight-saving time?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not.

Then, another thing: Our transportation system is being run on standard time. This legislation is going to bring about confusion. You would go to work on daylight-saving time, but if you wanted to catch a train, an airplane, or bus, you would switch over to standard time. Is it right, in order to accommodate a few people here in Washington, to disregard the rights of the people who are supplying the citizens of this city with food, and at the same time bring about the confusion that will naturally follow the passage of this bill? These people are entitled to some consideration, and I do not believe the people of Washington, if they really understood the hardships this legislation would impose upon the rural population, would be in favor of it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. This is going to make, perhaps, a 3 hours' difference in the transaction of business for Members of Congress from farm districts and farmers among their constituency, is it not?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It certainly is.

Mr. STEFAN. You cannot regulate the time when you slop the hogs or milk the cows, can you?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. No; you cannot do that.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman. The best news our people received on the farm after the war was the repeal of daylight-saving time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman is correct; and when the issue was before Congress it was repealed by practically unanimous vote.

We have been getting along on standard time for many many years, ever since this Government was formed. We made the change during the war. I did not think much of the change then. I think it did more harm than good during the war period.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, we believe in self-government and self-determination for the Philippines, for the Germans, for the Japanese, and for most of the other peoples of the world. I believe charity begins at home and that it would not be out of order to allow some self-government and some self-determination for the voteless, unrepresented people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD].

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, tells me that several polls have been taken on this subject amongst the people of the District of Columbia and that they run as high as 75 percent in favor of daylight-saving time.

Personally, it does not make any difference to me whether they use daylight time or standard time. Who are we to oppose the mandate of any people at any time in the United States of America? I believe that as Members of Congress we must and should recognize the wishes and concur in the mandate of the people we govern, that we should not oppose daylight-saving time if they so desire.

If the District of Columbia had self-government we would be under daylight-saving time at the present time, because that is what the people desire. Unfortunately, they cannot have it because Congress will not yield it to them.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. How many people were interviewed in those polls? Not more than six or eight thousand out of 900,000 residents.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I know only what the chairman of the committee told me and I am certain he would not misrepresent the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a great many people seem to be under the misapprehension that this daylight-saving time is hooked up with and originated in New York or some other part of the country. Daylight-saving time originated in my district. A very distinguished Republican official, the Honorable Robert Garland, gave this great gift to America. We have used it for some 20 years over in Pittsburgh and I may say to the gentleman from Virginia that I have not heard of any farmers of western Pennsylvania being very seriously "discombobulated" by daylight-saving time.

I think it is time to do something for the people of Washington.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the right of people to petition; I believe in the right of people to have the type of laws which they want and I have this thought so far as the District of Columbia is concerned. In the course of the last few weeks since this controversy has arisen, I have gone out of my usual way to find out from the people of the District what they want and up until 11 o'clock last night I had not found a single person from the District of Columbia who by word of mouth, by letter, or by telegram asked me to vote for this bill. Everyone I spoke to said he was against it.

Mr. Chairman, the Government departments are closed all day Saturday; and moving up the time an hour here in the Capital of the Nation will make governmental business more difficult—in the West where there is a difference of 1, 2, or 3 hours against Washington time. In these far western areas the situation will be made much more inconvenient. For instance, a telegram sent from my district in Louisiana at 3 o'clock on Friday would arrive here at about 5 o'clock, closing time, and too late for anything to be done until the following Monday. This means, in effect, that the people in the far West where time will differ by as many as 4 hours will have to get their requests by telegram started to Washington as early as Friday morning in order to have any hope of getting action before the following Monday.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated I am going to vote against this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, did I understand that the gentleman from South Carolina yielded all of his time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 5 minutes still remaining on the minority side.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman from South Carolina still have 5 minutes left after the gentleman from Illinois has finished?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, year after year for 15 years I have seen Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle come down into this well and belabor the District of Columbia and the portion it took of our legislative time for District affairs. Year after year for 15 years I have heard Member after Member in the well of the House assail the fact that Congress was serving as city council for the Nation's Capital. I took some stock of that argument. I felt there was some validity in the fact that in proportion as this takes time it does divest time from legislative duties on a national scale. In due course this argument developed to the point where finally the House and Senate set up a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, and I was one of the Members who served on that committee for 18 months. When we finally completed our labors we reported on the 4th day of March 1946, and then there followed a bill which was subsequently passed and signed by the President on the 2d day of August 1946. It was a rather broad-gaged bill. We increased our salaries in that bill. We increased our expense allowances in that bill. We passed a legislative lobby title. We included a bridge bill. We included a Federal tort claims act. What we were trying to do was to save time and economize on the time and the demands that were made upon the talents and the energies of Members of Congress.

As that bill was first reported, it contained a title to provide a measure of home rule for the District of Columbia. There is presently in the Senate a subcommittee of the Senate District Committee on Home Rule. There is in this House, in the Committee on the District of Columbia, a Subcommittee on Home Rule under the very able leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], who has been devoting a great deal of time to that subject.

Now, we come here not with a daylight saving bill but with a bill that is predicated upon a principle of home rule. You do not say in this bill that there shall be daylight time for the District of Columbia. This bill confers authority upon the administrative heads of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners, who are appointed by the President, to hold a hearing. If they should decide after hearings that there should be daylight-saving time in the National Capital, then they will take the necessary steps in order to provide that change of time.

There has been so much misapprehension about the pending bill. When you vote for this bill—and I hope it will go through by a resounding majority—you do not say that there shall be daylight-saving time in Washington, D. C. You simply confer power upon the appointive executive heads of the District of Columbia, after suitable hearing, whether or not in their wisdom and in all good conscience the time should be changed. I, for one, approve of it. They have daylight-saving time in Chicago. They voted by four to one in St. Louis last week for daylight saving. They have daylight saving in 10 different States of the Union. It started at midnight on Saturday night. They have daylight-saving time in New York City. They have daylight-saving time in Annapolis, Md., the next largest metropolitan center north of here. They have daylight-savings time in Baltimore, Md. The Governor of Maryland signed a bill recently whereby the three adjoining counties, in which so many of the District personnel live, can impose daylight saving as soon as it is done in the National Capital, if that is the decision of the District Commissioners. The Governor of Virginia, Governor Tuck, has informally notified the Boards of Trade of Arlington, Alexandria, and other cities, that if they want to set their clocks ahead, they may do so, but no State action was taken. But the point is that those people are allowed to fall in line.

We hear the argument about what distress will be imposed upon the farmers in the area. One of the largest milk distributors in the National Capital told me recently, and asked that I do not use his name, that milk is received at all hours of the day, and then it is homogenized and it is pasteurized and bottled and delivered the following day, and it offers no inconvenience so far as the farmer is concerned. If that argument is followed, then the arguments in the whole milkshed of northern Illinois, southern Wisconsin, and western Indiana, and a portion of Iowa would be equally valid, because Chicago is the largest metropolitan consumer area for that milkshed. If that argument is valid, it would be valid for the largest city in the gentleman's own State, New York City.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did this informant state when that milk which arrived here all during the day, left the farm?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not that I remember.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the important thing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He said, "We receive milk all hours of the day and we are bottling all the time, and milk is delivered the following day as late as 11 and 12 o'clock in the day."

Then in addition thereto, why I presume—and I cannot say that this is absolutely correct—but you know out of your own experience, if you have a family here, that most of the milk is marketed through the grocery stores in the District of Columbia. But here is a



voiceless, here is a voteless community of some 800,000 which has to come as a suppliant on its knees and say, "Please, Congress, most of us are for daylight savings; won't you kindly forget provincial thinking for a while and give us daylight saving?"

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other veterans' organizations are for it. The board of trade and the junior chamber of commerce have done a monumental amount of work in behalf of daylight saving. The newspapers, including the Washington Post and the Washington Times-Herald, have held polls here and by overwhelming majorities the people have expressed themselves for daylight saving.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. How many people voted on those polls?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that in one of those polls formally and informally they finally got up to nearly 66,000 people, and the polls represented different areas and different sources.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman means 6,600.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was one poll of 6,600, but there was an informal poll that represented the thinking, I believe, of 66,000. Every group, every industrial group, every business group that I can find out about in this man's town has been for daylight saving.

Now, what an astonishing thing. The Senate, mind you, the Senate of the United States, approved this same bill by a vote of 57 to 16, which is more than 3½ to 1. They were having some regard for the desires of the people here.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that, as the record will disclose, I voted for the daylight saving bill for the District when it was here before. However, as I understand the present bill, it simply seeks to invest in the Commissioners of the District the option and authority to put daylight saving time into effect after a hearing and after fair determination is made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, that will bring about a situation approximating the condition that prevails in other cities and towns across the country where determination is made by local authority as to what they want to do in respect to daylight saving.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. HALLECK. I propose to vote for this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am grateful to the majority leader.

Let me leave you with this one question, before the time runs out. If we do not propose to support a bill to confer upon the District Commissioners the authority to hold hearings and determine this sort of a proposition, why should the District Committee come in here and endeavor

to secure any kind of home-rule proposition in the interest of conserving time? Why should the District Committee submit to the Congress any proposal that is based upon this broad fundamental of home rule, because you would evidence that no matter what we do still you would not be in favor of conferring upon the duly appointed executive heads of the Nation's Capital the authority to deal with a proposition of this kind.

I earnestly suggest that we give these people an opportunity to represent their views before their own District Commissioners in the District Building and let the determination be made there whether or not there shall be daylight saving time for the District of Columbia. I would expect that much for my own folks back home if their interests were involved and I believe they would want me to do as much for the voteless residents of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. As a former chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am heartily in favor of this bill. Some such bill has been in the House on many occasions before and in different Congresses. I think the people in the District should be allowed to decide whether or not they want daylight-saving time. The debate here today seems to me a very strong argument for home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to have the statement from the gentlewoman from New Jersey, who served so long as chairman of this great committee, though I am not in accord with her viewpoint and with her position.

I have the highest esteem and admiration for our present chairman, the genial and able gentleman from the great State of Illinois, who has done such a magnificent job to try to bring this matter to a head in order to give the Congress an opportunity to decide it.

First, I want to talk to you about something that I believe means more than just the question of whether you personally want daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia or personally do not want it.

I had not intended to enter into this debate. I have heard all of the arguments and discussions about why we should have daylight-saving time and why we should not have it, and how it would put us to some personal inconvenience.

Mr. Chairman, we are deciding something here today that goes much further than the mere matter of how it affects us personally. The gentleman from Illinois has just brought it to your attention and I believe it well deserves your consideration. This House has expressed itself fully on this matter in recent weeks. Now, it is presented to you in a little different form. What are we asked to do here? We are asked to evade an issue that we passed on in

order that we may let someone else have the jurisdiction to determine the very thing that we voted against. If that is not passing the buck by the Congress, I would like to know what would be a good example of passing the buck.

And, next, I want to talk to you about the question of home rule. I am not saying that the District of Columbia should or should not have home rule, but I say to you, my colleagues, if the District of Columbia is to have home rule, why do we not approach it in a manner so as to give the District home rule and let them vote for their representatives. Are we going to do it piecemeal?

The gentleman says, "They have daylight-saving time in Chicago and New York and St. Louis." The fact is that they do not have daylight-saving time in the Seventh District of Arkansas, but that has nothing to do with my position in this matter at all. Just because we may have it or may not have it somewhere else in the country—is that to say that we are to evade our responsibility here on the floor of the House? Is this going to be the first step in the process of saying to the District of Columbia, "You can have your own government," notwithstanding the record that Congress has made over the past century and a half? There is the issue that confronts you in this House today, and I think you are going to have to decide it.

This question of putting babies to sleep an hour earlier and trying to get them up an hour earlier is a problem for the individual mother in the household. When you consider issues like this on a broad fundamental basis it amounts to a policy of government. The real question at issue here is whether this is still the Capital of the United States which belongs to all of the people of the United States instead of just to those who are privileged to be here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of determining whether or not daylight saving time should be established in the District of Columbia during the year 1947, the Commissioners of the District shall conduct open hearings at which the residents of the District may express their views on the establishment of such time.*

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 1, line 7, after the word "District", insert "and those in neighboring counties who may be affected."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer this, it may be said, as a perfecting amendment. It does not indicate that I am in agreement with the provisions of this bill. However, I offer it to bring to your attention a situation which is extremely unjust. We talk about home rule for the people of the District of Columbia. I think none of us would have any objection to the exercise of home rule in the District if, in the exercise of that power or privilege, they did not injure

other people. But when it is found—and it cannot be denied—that the exercise of home rule in the District with respect to daylight saving, injures a very large number of people who have no voice in the matter whatsoever, I think we should pause. I am certain that I am stating the facts.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said that in conversation with an unnamed milk dealer—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly, the gentleman from Illinois is anxious to get a complete expression on this matter and does not believe it ought to be ex parte. I have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York even though people in the outlying zones who are not responsible would come in in a permissive fashion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad of that, but I am going to develop this subject.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated in his address that an unnamed milk distributor or processor here in Washington told him that the milk came in during a period covering several hours during the morning, some of it as late as 11 or 12 o'clock. I asked him if that same informant had told him when the milk had to leave the farm at which it was produced, and there was no answer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer was that he did not know.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He did not know. Well, that is an important thing. It is perfectly true that milk coming into a great city arrives at varying times in the morning, but the time of its arrival depends entirely upon the distance over which it has been transported. The greater the distance the earlier the milk has to be put in the can and loaded on the truck. I have seen this thing work for years and it works a wretched hardship on the men who produce food. It compels them, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] said, to get up an hour earlier, in the dark, with no time off on Saturday. Nothing like the 8-hour day or the 40-hour week, perhaps working half a day on Sundays. They have no choice in the matter. They are helpless. The sun is their master. The Nation is divided geographically into time zones, if I may use that expression—eastern time, central time, mountain time, and Pacific time, across the continent to the Pacific Ocean. After years and years of experience those time zones have been laid out in order that those who earn their living, including those who produce the food in the several sections of the country, may have the greatest advantage of the shining of the sun. The time zones have been so erected as to conform as nearly as possible with sunrise, which commences in the east and travels through the morning westward, clear across the continent. Now, you cannot do away with the power of the sun in agriculture. It cannot be done. The sun is the master of the man who produces food. He has to get up with the sun and

do his best all through the sunny day and stay at work until the sun sets; otherwise he loses out. The changing of clocks, the changing of laws, does not prevent the sun being the master of the producer of food. When you force, through the vote of people in the city, most of whom do not have the slightest conception of where their food is produced, how it is produced, or by whom—when you force man out on the land, who is the slave of the sun, to get up an hour earlier in the dark the year around, you are inflicting a hardship upon him which is difficult to exaggerate. That is why I have for years been opposed to this whole illusion—this whole illusion—known as daylight saving.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have as guests in Washington today sixty bright and shining students and their directors and chaperones representing Northland College of Ashland, Wis. They compose a choir of some 60 voices that is completing a tour of eastern United States. They have appeared in the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York. Yesterday afternoon they gave a very impressive concert at the Foundry Methodist Church in this city. I had the honor and privilege of hearing them, and I wish each and every Member of this Congress had had the same honor and privilege.

Northland College is a small college, with an enrollment not exceeding 350 students, of which 75 percent have to work their own way. Yet they have organized a choir of 60 voices of such quality and training that they have been invited to broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting Co. and over the National Broadcasting Co., both Nation-wide chains.

This choir has brought great honor and tribute not only to their college but to the State of Wisconsin and, indeed, to the United States of America.

On behalf of the Members of Congress I welcome this group to Washington. They are going to make a survey and study over here of how Congress is operating. I hope they will go back with pleasant words, words to the effect that the Members of this body and the Members of the other body are trying their very desperate best to solve the Nation's ills and the world's ills.

Mr. Chairman, Northland College deserves the gratitude of every American. Twenty of the group in this choir are veterans of the last war. A poor but thriving and growing institution this choir is a living memorial of what can be done when the will to do is there. Welcome to Washington Northland College. You came here and left a deep impression on the hearts of many of our

Nation's leaders. We are truly proud of you. You are an inspiration to all of us. Come again.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a short history of this college, this choir, together with a list of names of this group, their director, and chaperones, be spread upon the pages of the RECORD at this point.

#### HISTORICAL SKETCH OF NORTHLAND COLLEGE CHOIR

The Northland College Choir came into being in 1931 under Prof. Sigvart J. Steen. Although Northland's music department has been a feature of the college since its founding, the a cappella choir, singing only sacred music, was a departure from the program usually followed. In the early days of the academy and college there were separate organizations of glee clubs for the men and women, as well as concert orchestras, and the smaller voice and instrumental ensembles.

The choir took its first tour in 1934, traveling into southwest Wisconsin and eastern Minnesota. The first Atlantic coast or New England tour was undertaken in 1935. Since that time, tours to the East have been interspersed with tours into Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The choir won national recognition singing in Constitution Hall as part of the program of the National Congress of the DAR. It has also appeared before the National Federation of Music Clubs, and its radio concerts have included broadcasts from Radio City in New York City.

The last tour by the mixed choir was made in 1942, that fateful year when our minds were temporarily diverted from the amenities and joys of life. The rumblings of war, reverberating into college ranks, soon changed our mixed choir into a small girls' chorus. Prof. Sigvart Steen and his successor, Prof. Harold Brown, both resigned as director and took their places in the armed services.

Northland soon came to resemble a women's seminary more than a coeducational college, and Mrs. Kathryn Ragsdale Church was called to direct the remnants of the choir. Mrs. Church doubled the size of the girls' chorus the first year and continued to increase the membership until 1945 when there were 44 girls singing in the chorus. During the first 2 years Mrs. Church trained the chorus, and short trips were taken in the surrounding territory. Since bus companies were not accepting charters, the transportation problem was solved by the use of cars which were supplied through the generosity of trustees and faculty members.

Impressed with the excellent musicianship and attributes of quality displayed by the chorus, two Northland trustees, Mr. George I. Haight and Mr. Howard I. Potter, both of Chicago arranged to bring the chorus to Chicago where they sang in Kimball Hall. On that same trip they sang in the Public Service Auditorium in Milwaukee through the courtesy of former Governor Julius P. Heil, who is also a Northland trustee.

Last spring a tour was scheduled through Central Wisconsin and Northern Michigan, and included besides evening concerts a number of high school appearances.

When college opened last September, many veterans thronged the campus and among them were former Northlanders who returned to take up their studies where they left off 3 or 4 years years before. With this influx of students tryouts were held and approximately 60 voices were selected to be trained for a mixed choir. That this is a carefully chosen group and an expertly trained one was manifested in the outstanding concert presented during the past Christmas season.



It was acclaimed by critics to be the finest program ever to be presented in the city of Ashland.

It is with confidence and real pride that the Northland College Choir is presented to you this evening.

KATHRYN RAGSDALE CHURCH, DIRECTOR,  
NORTHLAND COLLEGE CHOIR

Kathryn Ragsdale Church has a rich background of specialized training and experience which makes her a most capable choral director and teacher of voice. Part of her experience includes 8 years of acting as a judge at the State music festivals held in Iowa.

She is a graduate of Christian College and has attended Iowa State Teachers College and the Conservatory of Music at the University of Iowa. She has studied voice with Afra Kirsch of Chicago and has also had private voice coaching under Mrs. Elizabeth Birney Schmidt and Mr. Thomas Muir, both of New York City, and Mr. Luther Richman, who is now president of the Music Educators National Conference.

#### BRIEF HISTORY OF NORTHLAND COLLEGE

Northland College, located at Ashland, Wis., was founded in October 1892 as North Wisconsin Academy. The leader of the movement to found an academy at this pioneer outpost was the Reverend Edwin P. Wheeler, son of one of the early missionaries on Madeline Island, the largest of the Apostle Islands group in Lake Superior.

As Mr. Wheeler's dreams took shape others caught his enthusiasm. Working closely with Mr. Wheeler were the Reverend George Nelson, the general missionary of the Congregational Churches of Wisconsin, and Dr. Edwin Ellis, Ashland's first doctor, who came in 1855 when about a dozen cabins straggling along the shore of the bay comprised the entire community.

Northland, born in the colorful days of the lumbering industry, was still found standing after the echoes of the lumberman's ax had died away and the hordes had stripped the lands of their virgin timber wealth. It was indeed a desolate setting for such a cherished dream, but the founders of the school surmounted obstacles that would have broken most men. They refused to accept defeat but rather, were fired with new enthusiasm to nurture and strengthen the one thing which was needed the most—a school to train the young men and women of North Wisconsin who would be faced with the problems arising from the inevitable economic readjustment. Their labors have borne fruit and today Northland College is still rendering a service unsurpassed in any other part of the State.

In 1907 articles of incorporation were drawn up for a college department, and in June 1912 the first class of college students was graduated. One of the first graduates now heads the science department. Academy and college work were carried on simultaneously until 1932 when it was felt that the academy was no longer needed. The advent of the State-graded schools in the rural communities answered the need in secondary education and after a service of 40 years the academy was discontinued. Northland College continued to grow and widen its field of service and is still the only liberal arts college within a radius of 200 miles.

Though Northland's physical plant is utilized to capacity and there is need for more buildings, the work continues under the direction of an able administration and loyal faculty. The excellent record of alumni accomplishment is monumental evidence of sound basic training received at Northland College. Four college presidents are listed among Northland's alumni. Many leading research scientists, ministers, journalists,

librarians, educators, doctors, and industrial leaders began their work at Northland.

Like all colleges, Northland laid her sacrifice on the altar of the war gods, writing the names of 19 young men among the stars. Over 400 Northlanders answered the call to service. The war years were troublesome for the college but the unselfish devotion of the faculty and students together with the loyalty of understanding friends helped to keep the college running so that the doors were open when the young men and women returned searching for a way back to peaceful living.

Sacrifice and privation form a large part of Northland's cornerstone. Love, faith, devotion, Christian ideals, and a fighting spirit were stirred into the mortar. The early days were filled with trials and burdens which were shared by friends who appreciated Northland's great task and wanted to have a part in it. A deep-rooted faith has been justified and Northland College stands high in the ranks of Wisconsin colleges. The rich heritage of faith and tenacity left by her founders is Northland's greatest spiritual strength and power. Such memories as are written in her history will serve to burnish the ideals by which Northland lives and grows.

#### ITINERARY

Tuesday, April 8, Akron, Ohio: First Congregational Church.

Wednesday, April 9, Elmira, N. Y.: Park Congregational Church.

Thursday, April 10, New York City: Rotary luncheon at Commodore Hotel.

Friday, April 11, Queens Village, N. Y.: Hollis Avenue Congregational Church.

Sunday, April 13, Westfield, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Monday, April 14, Greenfield, Mass.: Second Congregational Church.

Tuesday, April 15, Lynn, Mass.: Boston Street Methodist Church.

Wednesday, April 16, New Bedford, Mass.: The United Church.

Thursday, April 17, Haverhill, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Sunday, April 20, Melrose, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Monday, April 21, Wakefield, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Tuesday, April 22, Norwood, Mass.: First Congregational Church.

Wednesday, April 23, Bristol, Conn.: First Congregational Church.

Friday, April 25, Bethel, Conn.: Bethel High School.

Saturday, April 26, Philadelphia, Pa.: James Evans Memorial Presbyterian Church.

Sunday, April 27, Washington, D. C.: Foundry Methodist Church.

Monday, April 28, Washington, D. C.: Luncheon, Capitol Dining Room.

Tuesday, April 29, Johnstown, Pa.: Central High School.

Thursday, May 1, Green Bay, Wis.: Union Congregational Church.

Friday, May 2, Rhinelander, Wis.: First Congregational Church.

Saturday, May 3, Park Falls, Wis.: City Hall.

In addition to the above concerts, several radio broadcasts and special convocations are included in the schedule of appearances. Individual soloists have participated as guest soloists in Sunday church services.

#### PERSONNEL OF THE CHOIR

Soprano: Betty Greech, freshman, Owen, Wis.; Julie Johnson, special, Hollywood, Calif.; Mary Lou Ferkovich, sophomore, Melrose, Wis.; Mary Dexter, freshman, Bayfield, Wis.; Patricia Biglow, junior, Ashland, Wis.; June Emerson, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Cleone Pecteau, junior, Ashland, Wis.; Madeline Lindquist, junior, Chicago, Ill.; Betty Jane Larson, freshman, Ironwood, Mich.; Rita

Reed, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Betty Johnson, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Patricia Berg, junior, Ashland, Wis.; Mary Jeanne Welker, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Sally Murray, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Mary Lynn Eisner, sophomore, Trout Creek, Mich.; Joyce Synnott, freshman, Rib Lake, Wis.

Alto: Kathryn Wilson, junior, High Bridge, Wis.; Jeane Anne Johnson, freshman, Monroe, Wis.; Rose Mary McDonnell, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Audrey Reistad, freshman, Rib Lake, Wis.; Jacqueline Klatt, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Ruth Spoolman, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Rose Marie Hinds, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Emmy Lou Forster, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Eleanor Perrin, sophomore, Mason, Wis.; Virginia Darling, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; Connie Moller, freshman, Weyerhaeuser, Wis.; Eileen Carroll, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Elaine Anich, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Marguerite Johnson, sophomore, Ironwood, Mich.; Elaine Schroeder, freshman, De Pere, Wis.; Avonel Anderson, senior, Rice Lake, Wis.

Tenor: Gilbert Vickers, junior, Springfield, Mass.; Gene Carlson, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; William Mauliffe, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Lowell McMullen, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Edward Bardill, sophomore, Spooner, Wis.; Richard Strohane, senior, Ashland, Wis.; Kenneth Daniels, freshman, Ladysmith, Wis.; Guillermo de la Riestra, sophomore, Havana, Cuba; Henry McKenzie, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; Bruce Johnson, freshman, Hancock, Mich.; James Zar, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Jack Boucher, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.

Bass: Lyman Thompson, freshman, Antigo, Wis.; John Dosedel, freshman, Ladysmith, Wis.; John Ferris, senior, Hancock, Wis.; Howard Johnson, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Lyle LaPoint, freshman, Chicago, Ill.; James Burlager, freshman, Washburn, Wis.; Marvin Sykes, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Dale Borowick, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Howard Konkol, freshman, Ashland, Wis.; Kenneth Martinson, sophomore, Ashland, Wis.; Milton Carlson, sophomore, Mason, Wis.; Lawrence Clark, freshman, Wauwatosa, Wis.; Sam Wheeler, junior, Ashland, Wis.

#### APPRECIATION

To those churches, alumni, and friends who helped to make this tour possible, we wish to express a word of appreciation. We sincerely hope that the concert which you hear will be worthy of the interest you have manifested by your presence, and merit your support.

It was with the financial help of New Englanders that our first building, Wheeler Hall, was made possible. A few years later a family in Massachusetts gave us the funds to erect Woods Hall. It was Congregational women who gave us our ladies' dormitory, Memorial Hall. Our library was built largely through the efforts of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Others have kept the doors of Northland open by their regular contributions to the current operating budget. To you may we say that this choir is a product of Northland College—your school.

GLADYS W. ULINE,

Secretary to the President,  
Manager 1947 Choir Tour.

#### DEDICATION

The concerts of this 1947 choir tour are humbly dedicated to the memory of the 19 Northlanders who gave their lives in battle during the world conflict, and to the 400 other Northlanders who struggled with them in order to again raise their voice in a song of freedom.

Raymond Adelman, class 1920; Fred Anderson, class 1940; Donald Benson, class 1943; John Cate, class 1939; William Fuller, class 1944; Everett Gillam, class 1940; Edmund

Jeffers, class 1940; Robert Lynch, class 1940; Wallace Ringham, class 1943; Morris Ristvedt, class 1939; Edward Rogers, class 1942; John Schoonover, academican 1921; William Sherry, academican 1943; William Steinmetz, academican 1946; Franklin Tomenendale, academican 1942; Wesley Warvi, academican 1932; Charles Watson, academican 1937; Gerald Weiss, academican 1946; Danforth Welty, academican 1941.

#### MUSIC FACULTY

Perry Howard Yaw, Jr., bachelor of science, Mansfield State Teachers College, master of arts, University of Michigan, director of music department, assistant professor of music theory and instrumental music, director of orchestra and string ensemble.

Kathryn Ragsdale Church, teacher diploma in voice and piano, Christian College, Iowa State Teachers College, Iowa State University Conservatory of Music, studied voice with Afra Kirsch, of Chicago, Ill., and has had voice coaching under Mrs. Elizabeth Birney Schmidt and Thomas Muir, of New York City, as well as Luther Richman, president of Music Educators National Conference, instructor of music theory and voice, director of Northland College choir.

Marcia-Mary Ball, bachelor of music, American Conservatory of Music, master of music, American Conservatory of Music, assistant professor of music theory, piano, and organ.

Ingr Marie Lien, teacher diploma in violin, Oberlin Conservatory of Music, bachelor of music, Philadelphia Musical Academy, master of music, Philadelphia Musical Academy, University of Michigan, assistant professor of music theory, violin, and piano.

Manley E. MacDonald, president, 1945, bachelor of arts, Greenville College, master of arts, University of Michigan, doctor of philosophy, University of Michigan.

Lewis H. Brumbaugh, dean, 1945, bachelor of arts, Mount Morris College, master of arts, University of Chicago, bachelor of divinity, Yale University, doctor of philosophy, University of Pittsburgh.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

One of the basic purposes of this bill is to provide that the District Commissioners shall hold a hearing to secure an expression of views from the citizens of the District of Columbia. Certainly there can be no objection to an expression of views by people who live in the adjoining counties of Virginia and Maryland, and I, for one, do not object. I believe I bespeak the sentiment of the membership of the committee when I say they would have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York; certainly I do not.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman feel that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia could have any authority over the surrounding territory of Virginia and Maryland?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The question of authority is not involved here. The language of the bill is that the Commissioners shall hold a hearing at which the people may express their views. That makes it entirely permissive. So I see nothing wrong with permitting people who live outside and beyond the District line from expressing their views also, because it is on an informal basis.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it contended by the gentleman from Illinois that this bill does not give the Commissioners authority to determine whether or not there shall be daylight-saving time in the District?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very definitely it does give them the authority after they have had a hearing and made a determination that there should be daylight-saving time.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, does the gentleman contend that the authority given to the Commissioners of the District can extend to Maryland and Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It gives no such authority. The bill merely provides that the Commissioners shall hold a hearing at which the people may make an expression of their views for the benefit of the executive heads of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] about the farmer being the slave of the sun.

Back in the old days they used to tell the story of a Negro whose employer gave him an old watch with a long brass chain. He put it on and went to town. Another Negro hailed him and said: "Hey, Bill, what time is it?"

He looked at his watch and said: "Hit's 15 minutes after half past of a quarter before 11 o'clock. Hereafter when you wants to know what time it is, you look at de sun what's made for po' folks and don't be pestering gentlemen on de streets."

The sun is what our time is regulated by. I have never seen any advantage come from daylight saving. I went through it in the First World War and I saw it imposed during the last war. I have always thought we would have been better off if we had just gone ahead with the regular standard time, governed, as the gentleman from New York said, by the sun which the farmers go by.

Again, you are moving up the time at which the employees of the Federal Government will leave their work in the afternoon. Already every department is closed on Saturday. Now, under this bill, they will close Friday afternoon at the very time that a Member of Congress has the most time to contact the departments about matters affecting his district. You will find the departments closed and the employees gone home.

I do not agree with the gentleman from New York that you can impose this time on the people of Virginia and Maryland. You may make it apply to Government employees, but if you do you will have to make it apply to Government employees elsewhere, in other States. I cannot see how you are going to make this apply to the surrounding territory of Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that it should not be made to apply elsewhere, but automatically it applies. If the public markets of Washington open an hour earlier in the morning it means that the farmer has to start an hour earlier in the morning to get there.

Mr. RANKIN. If the bill in its present form passes it would not apply to the people who work in the Pentagon Building, which is over in Virginia; is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suspect the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, the majority of the people on the pay roll of the War Department would not be affected.

Mr. Chairman, I am just like the Negro; let us look at the sun which was made for "po' folks" and be governed accordingly and stay by standard time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this involves the question whether you want the folks in the District of Columbia to have the right to make some decision as to whether they are going to have daylight-saving time. You know, the Congress takes up a lot of time with District of Columbia affairs. I happen to be chairman of a Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the District. Do you know some of the bills we have had to consider from the District? Oh, we have had a bill to regulate the hours of barbers in the District. We have had one for the undertakers. We have a bill to get rid of the starlings in Washington. I can tell you how to get rid of the English sparrows, but not over this microphone. Yes, we have a bill to require sanitary straws in the District.

Now, it is ridiculous that all of those little matters—I call them chicken-feed bills—should come before the Congress for decision. It takes time of the committee and it takes the time of this Congress. But the Commissioners must bring all these little problems to the Congress. Whether it is starlings, barbers, undertakers, or sanitary straws, those matters must come to the Congress. Last week we had a bill that would permit the Commissioners to tear down some road signs by the White House. They cannot even change the name of a street in Washington without coming to Congress. If you believe in the right of home rule and that the Commissioners should handle the affairs of the District, and if you believe that they ought to have the right to hold hearings on whether or not the District should have daylight-saving time, then you should have no objection to this bill. Personally, I would be opposed to a bill of this sort in the western part of my State because my people do not want it, but if they did, I would support it. The Commissioners must hold hearings—the people decide—that is the democratic way of doing things.



Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Congress and the District Committee of the House, or a subcommittee thereof, is not in effect the council for the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I think that is true, and the District Committee voted for this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Those matters that the gentleman has just mentioned are matters, of course, that are usually considered by the councils of the various municipalities of the Nation, are they not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true. I have been one of those Members of Congress that felt like the people of the District of Columbia ought to have a little self-rule of their own.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman brings up the question of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I have been a member for 10 years, being the city council for the District of Columbia. In the city councils of other cities, whatever they do, subject to the approval of the mayor, becomes law. If the Congress will follow the advice and recommendations of the city council of the District of Columbia this bill will become law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right, if they will follow those recommendations.

I think as far as home rule for the District is concerned they ought to have the right to elect their Commissioners. I believe personally in the city-manager form of government where they have some business logic in the government. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] and his committee are now studying the problem of home rule. If you do not believe the city ought to have home rule, you ought to vote against the bill. This bill does not state that there is going to be daylight-saving time; it gives the Commissioners the right to hold a hearing of interested citizens and make a decision. I think that is democratic; I think that is the proper way to proceed. I feel the House ought to give that right to the Commissioners and to the folks living in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, Billy Sunday once said, speaking of prohibition and the effort to regulate the saloon, that you might as well attempt to regulate "a powder mill in hell" as to regulate a saloon. I think as far as this Congress or anyone else attempting to regulate the sun is concerned, we would have about as much chance as Billy Sunday said we would have in regulating the saloon.

The first speech I ever attempted to make on the floor of this Congress was against daylight-saving time, because the people of Ohio did not want it. It

was a definite hardship upon those people. I also helped to vote the repeal of daylight-saving time. I also voted against this bill 2 weeks ago today. However, it was a different proposition we voted on then than that which is before us today. Today we are simply saying that the people of the District shall have a right to determine the matter for themselves, and who am I or who is any Member of this Congress to say they shall not have that right? Therefore, I now reverse my position. I am still opposed to daylight saving in my district and State, but I would not deny anyone the right to decide on it himself. Therefore I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Ohio who just spoke will not leave the room, because I want him to know that the utter sophistry of this bill is simply this: On February 24 we voted down the daylight-saving proposition. This bill would be subject to a point of order for that reason if it were not for the fact that the Senate saw fit to pass this sophistry which states that the District of Columbia Commissioners may take a poll. It does not say the people shall vote, it does not say they shall be required to vote; it merely means that we are not giving the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote, for it means that under some sort of an informal proposition maybe the Commissioners will hold a meeting. They will advertise it or give notice in the paper and then down here in one of the committee rooms they will have a hearing at which maybe 200 or 300 or 400 people will express themselves. Does not that show the utter sophistry of this situation? The people do not vote.

You are being asked to say that you do not have enough brains to pass on this matter, that you should leave it up to two men. That is the actual situation we are in in this case. The most ridiculous argument is that it gives the people of the District of Columbia the right to express themselves. That is perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that the people express themselves through the medium of citizens associations, of which there are nearly 70. It is fair to assume that the heads of those associations, who are gathered into a common council known as the Federation of Citizens Associations, will express themselves, and they have expressed themselves in an overwhelming majority in favor of daylight saving. They are for the present bill.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman places it on that basis, I may say that on some other matters of which I know concerning which the citizens associations have expressed themselves the Commissioners have paid not too close attention.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman is a very practical politician.

Mr. O'HARA. No; do not say that.

Mr. BREHM. When a majority of a group express themselves, I imagine the gentleman gives heed to them. Even though the citizens of the District do not vote for the Commissioners, does not the gentleman feel that the Commissioners are practical politicians enough to listen to the majority, and that they will not deliberately force this upon the people unless the majority of the people desire it?

Mr. O'HARA. I will not argue with the gentleman on that proposition, but, of course, we find ourselves often in the same position. Sometimes we do not agree with the majority of the people in our districts if we think that the rules of logic compel us to come to an opposite conclusion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know that the gentleman is a distinguished lawyer in his State so I take the liberty of asking him this question. Do you think this Congress that is vested with the power and authority to determine these questions with reference to the District of Columbia has any power to delegate that authority to two or three men to make a decision for the people of the District of Columbia?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is a very fine lawyer and has raised a question which did occur to me but which I did not want to raise. But I will say, this is an attempt to unlawfully delegate authority to two Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

I now yield to my young friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will my able and distinguished friend from Minnesota tell me just what adverse effect the passage of this bill would have on our farmers in Minnesota?

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, I am not voting on this proposition on that basis at all. I am voting on it because, as I said before—the gentleman would have heard me if he had been here, which he was not—I do not like the daylight-saving time. If this bill passes, if the gentleman has to get up an hour earlier on one of these hot steaming Washington mornings, which he has not yet experienced, although he may be for this bill now he certainly will say that he made a mistake.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I started from my home city of Binghamton in New York State yesterday to return to Washington. As soon as I hit the Pennsylvania border I had to inquire what time of day it was. A few hours later I hit the Maryland line and there again I was in a quandary because, unlike Pennsylvania and New York, Maryland is on the old time. Imagine my consternation when I again crossed over into the District and found

that the same time existed here as in Maryland. In other words, there were four great sections or divisions of government that I passed through yesterday on my trip and I found there was a great difference practically every place I visited.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It should be said that the cities of Annapolis and Baltimore are on daylight-saving time by authority of an ordinance enacted by the people there and the counties adjoining the District line have authority under a bill which was recently passed by the Maryland Legislature and which has been signed by the Governor to follow the lead of the District of Columbia in the matter of daylight-saving time if the District adopts daylight-saving time.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that I am not addressing my remarks at the present time to the issue of daylight-saving time. The issue, as some gentlemen have said, goes much further into the scheme of things of our representative form of government. As one who has always been violently partisan as far as the championing of the rights of men and women all over the country to enjoy their privilege of participating in a representative form of government, I feel that the time has come for us to consider representative government in the District of Columbia, which I believe is the only place in the entire country that does not enjoy such a constitutional privilege. I want to go on record here today as being in favor of the nearly 1,000,000 inhabitants of the District of Columbia who are good patriotic Americans and who are able to decide for themselves the vital issues they are concerned with. I think the Congress is making history by taking this position. It is evidencing its interest in the same kind of government which we have back in our home districts in every township, county, and subdivision of government, in the various States, and, finally, in the Federal Government itself. It is a challenge—and I believe this question presents the very beginning of that challenge—that 800,000 inhabitants of the District of Columbia, now voteless, now without any expression of opinion in government, now without any opportunity to rule themselves—this question goes to the heart of this issue, and gives them the first step they have ever had in the matter of home rule. Home rule and representative government go hand in hand. Home rule is the issue which already the people of the United States have decided upon and which they feel ought to be given to themselves. Finally, when residents of the District of Columbia obtain that blessed privilege of representing themselves, I believe that the problem of constitutional government in the United States will be solved. For that reason, I am voting for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has well stated, the Committee on the District of Columbia is really, in fact, the city council of the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the committee, and I have served on this committee for a period of over 10 years. We have had to consider all matters of legislation affecting the welfare of this community. This year is no different from any other. From the middle of January, as chairman of the Committee on the Fiscal Relations of the District of Columbia, I have been sitting constantly in respect to the consideration of the over-all tax problem of the District of Columbia, and also the question of the teachers' salary increase which we had here last week. This committee is busy from one end of the legislative year to the other. It is an additional load that we gladly assume, because it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to consider all matters pertaining to the welfare of this community, just so long as we deny the right to the people of the District of Columbia to settle those questions themselves. This is a question that I believe ought to be determined by local option, insofar as we are permitting it to be determined that way, by permitting the administrators of the District of Columbia, the three District Commissioners, to hold hearings and from those hearings determine what is the viewpoint of the people of the District of Columbia.

Here we find a poll taken by one of the local newspapers, that the sentiment is in favor of daylight saving in the District of Columbia 8 to 1, yet the membership of this House, practically every one of us who will leave the District of Columbia, and go home into our own districts during the month of July or August or whenever we will adjourn, are denying the right to the people of the District of Columbia to have what they consider they are entitled to, daylight saving in the District of Columbia.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we are wasting a lot of time on matters that personally are of but very little interest to us. Of course, we are interested in what goes on back in our own States, but every State north of us along the coast, whether it be New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, or Rhode Island, has daylight saving. To be sure, it was quite confusing when we picked up the paper yesterday to find out what the radio schedule was. We found when we turned the dial that the program we were interested in was on an hour ago.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to follow the recommendations of this committee which has given so freely of its time in the determination of the problems of the District of Columbia. I hope that this bill as amended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] will be approved this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the argument of the gentleman from New York, the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] that this was a question of home rule misstates the real issue.

Then, too, I am surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] should want to put through a bill which will require Federal employees to get up and go to work an hour earlier each workday. I cannot understand the gentleman with the large family that he has, always in favor, as he has been in favor, of those who must work, now supporting a bill which will require them to get to work an hour earlier in the morning, so the golf player can get out an hour earlier in the afternoon.

These two gentlemen have mistaken the issue. It is not one of home rule.

This measure directly affects us and our constituents. By moving the clock ahead, every Member of Congress has to get over to his office an hour earlier. What for? To satisfy the people in the District.

Well, back in my country, the tail does not wag the dog all the time, not all of the time; the dog has something to say about it once in a while. And yet we will have to go to work an hour earlier, and, as one Member said—I think it was the gentleman from Mississippi—you who want to work Saturdays and your people want you to work and you are working in your office Saturday, when you call up a department and ask for information and the answer is "Nobody home," they have closed the office. Under this bill they will close an hour earlier. They now have a number of holidays each year, and I think in addition they have 15 days' sick leave and 30 days' annual leave. That is 45 days they now have, and every Saturday off.

Now, once in a while somewhere, sometime, somebody has got to work. The folks in my district call up my office in the afternoon and want to know something—want action. I must learn from a department down here, not on Saturdays, but on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays. My home folks call me. I have to tell them I cannot get an answer because the Federal employees have gone home. "What time do you quit down there?" "Well, they have gone home." It is 4:30, and we are on Washington time.

Now, these people do not have to work for the Government, but if they do ask for and accept a job, then they, as well as Members of Congress, should render service when the people want it.

When they tell us that it is a question of home rule, they are in error. It is a



question of whether your people in your district and my people in my district are going to get service out of Washington after 4 o'clock in the afternoon, or whether when the clock strikes 4 on 5 days a week there is no service in Washington because somebody here wants to quit to go fishing, to play golf, to play tennis, or do something else, and as a result we cannot get service, nor can they through us get service.

I say it is about time that the Congress began to legislate and continue to legislate on matters that we were sent here to legislate on, and not just make it easy for people who come to Washington to work a part of the time for a wage that is higher than our folks back home get.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the Wadsworth amendment. The committee has no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 116, noes 12.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. If, as a result of the hearings held pursuant to the first section of this act, the Commissioners should decide that daylight-saving time should be established in the District during the year 1947, the Commissioners are authorized to advance the standard time for the District 1 hour for any period of the year 1947 not earlier than the last Sunday of April of such year and not later than the last Sunday of September of such year. Any such time established by the Commissioners pursuant to this act shall, during the period for which it is applicable, be considered the standard time for the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners shall forthwith proceed in the exercise of the authority herein contained and shall, as soon as practicable, publish their findings and orders thereunder.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 2, line 10, strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided, however, That the establishment of such time for the District of Columbia shall not be construed to require any change in time for services in interstate commerce, nor shall any action by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the governing body of any municipality be construed to require a change in time for any service which originates beyond a State line or is the subject of a contract in interstate commerce."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane and covers interstate commerce as distinguished from local jurisdiction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I shall not contend, of course, that the amendment is germane under the rules of the House, but it is pertinent and I suggest that it accomplishes the

purpose that the gentleman ought to want to accomplish and in line with the argument advanced there should not be any objection to it. It will improve the bill considerably and also improve its chances of passage.

The amendment says:

Provided, however, That the establishment of such time for the District of Columbia shall not be construed to require any change in time for services in interstate commerce, nor shall any action by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the governing body of any municipality be construed to require a change in time for any service which originates beyond a State line or is the subject of a contract in interstate commerce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have no authority whatsoever over interstate commerce. The phraseology here might raise some very delicate questions of interpretation and definitely mutilate the purposes of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The intent of the amendment is to enact the purposes of the bill proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] which would relieve radio stations, for example, in outlying States from having to change their schedules because the time is changed in some city where a program might originate. It would also relieve the railroads of the responsibility of changing their time to conform to a change in time in some city where a train starts. You might turn on your radio, if this amendment were adopted, and count on getting a program at the time it used to originate according to the zone you might be in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The administrative difficulty of the amendment would heighten confusion and it might take months to resolve that confusion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, of course I am not responsible for that, but it is a problem that the Congress should address itself to. We have an opportunity here to correct it but probably will not be able to do so if the gentleman interposes his point of order.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. It illustrates what we do in this bill in affecting the people who come in here from all over the country also.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. I regret that the gentleman from Illinois in this particular matter seems not to be able to let his usual generous nature dictate consideration of the amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Would not the adoption of this amendment create more confusion?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The purpose is to make it decidedly more acceptable to the people of the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota goes beyond the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, and is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, although a member of the District Committee, it is very seldom that I make a statement on the floor of this House with reference to District legislation. But I have a feeling in my heart about this matter and I cannot pass the opportunity to make a short statement.

I have served on the Committee on the District of Columbia for about 4 years. I have enjoyed that service. For that service the members of the District Committee, except from the District citizens themselves, receive no praise. I have thought several times of resigning from the committee, but it is a job that somebody in this Congress has to do, and there are not many of you that want to do it. If you had been sent to this Congress to represent the people of the District of Columbia, by the votes of the people of the District of Columbia, we would not have spent 3 minutes on this little bill today; not 3 minutes. I just want you to quietly ask yourselves, not your neighbors, but just ask yourselves this question: If I had been sent to this Congress by the votes of the people of the District of Columbia, what would I do with this bill?

Now, there have been some here today who have intimidated that passage of the bill would be equivalent to passing the buck. Well, if that be true then we have passed the buck many, many times to the Commissioners of the District, and you should not be embarrassed in doing so again. But I do not believe passage of this bill could be so construed. I see no harm and no wrong in the Commissioners of the District, after calling in the residents of the District, determining themselves whether or not they should have daylight-saving time. What is wrong with it?

There are many of you here today—you will not publicly so say—who are opposed to the District of Columbia having the right of ballot. Well, I will say publicly I am opposed to it. But let me say to you now unless you give to the people of the District of Columbia a few of the things that they want in which there could possibly be no harm or no wrong, then the demand is going to be so strong upon this Congress in years to come that you are going to have to give them the ballot. Now, the question is just this: Do you want to give to the people of the District one of the minor, little, ordinary things that they are asking—that is this: Daylight saving? You know down deep in your hearts that nearly all of the citizens of this District want it. What would you do if you had been sent to Congress by their votes?

I live in a rural district. There are 153,000 farmers and farm people residing in my district. They are a wonderful people. I do not think they give one tinker's hoot whether or not the District has daylight saving, midnight saving, or whether District residents work at night and sleep all day, or vice versa. I believe that your people are no different from mine. They will respect you more for casting your vote in keeping with the desires of the District residents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think his constituents will be pleased when they learn that these two Commissioners have said to all these Federal employees here that they do not need to give service to the Congressmen or the people of the District after half-past 3 in the afternoon every day?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The legislation contemplates no such. If it did, I would be against it. I think the gentleman is using a vague and misleading illustration of what the legislation contemplates. There are Representatives here from California. The sun does not go down out there for 4 or 5 hours until after it does here. I have not heard the California Representatives complain because the Government offices are not open until 8 or 9 o'clock p. m. eastern time, which is about closing time—5 o'clock—on the west coast.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The departments and the Congress will all be on the same time. From the standpoint of putting in a given number of hours a day, there will be precisely no difference whatsoever.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you going to have the District tell us what time we shall get up and what time we are going to go to work? That is going a little bit far.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All I ask you to do is vote as your conscience dictates; and when you do, I have no fear but that this measure will have your approval.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: On page 1, line 9, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"The Commissioners of the District shall report their findings to the District Committees of the House and Senate with their recommendations."

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the whole purpose of this bill is to permit the people of the District to express themselves, but we then go a little further and give to the Commissioners the right to determine what shall be done. I do not think there is anything democratic about that, particularly. There is democracy in permitting the people of the District to ex-

press themselves, and certainly the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York was all right, but the Commissioners were not elected by the people and the people have no right to say what is going to be done.

I do not know whether the House held any hearings on this or not, but I do know that the House voted down daylight-saving time not very long ago. This is simply a method of circumventing what we have already done and giving three Commissioners the right to determine whether we were right or wrong.

Remember we had daylight-saving time during the war, but we had it all over the entire Nation, and that did not complicate problems so very much. Many disadvantages of daylight-saving time have been pointed out here today. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] pointed out the fact that people would be getting up earlier. The gentleman from New York pointed out the fact that the farmer would have to get up earlier to get his produce into the market. The gentleman from Mississippi has said it does not make any difference to the farmer what time the people get up here in Washington or what time they have, but it does make a difference throughout the Nation.

As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has told you many times, you get calls and you want information from the departments. You find now that it takes all you can do to attend your committee hearings and get back to the office and make your calls in time to find somebody down there to do it. Now, when we go into daylight-saving time, they are going to get off earlier and you will not be able to finish that work in the afternoon. You will not find anyone in the departments, and you cannot find them in Saturday.

I remember daylight-saving time—we had it during the war in the winter. Do not forget the winter months are important too. In the winter we did not have daylight according to clocks until after 8 o'clock. Now you are going to have that situation again, just as some of the Members have pointed out here today. These people who have to get up and report to work by 7:30 or 8 in the morning are going to be handicapped because they are going to have to get up before daylight to do it.

I will tell you what this is exactly, and if you want to find out you can investigate. I do not object to people playing golf; in fact, I like to play a little golf once in a while. I would rather do a little fishing on the banks of the Potomac late in the afternoon, but we do not usually get to do that. The main reason for this daylight-saving time is the man who works in an office and can report at 9, 10, or 11, if he pleases. Then he wants the afternoon to end early so he can get out and play some golf. Go to the working people that have to get up early, to people who have children that they have to send to school. They are going to have to get the children up earlier in the morning.

I think the proper thing to do is let the people come in and be heard, and let

the Commissioners take the testimony and then come to the Senate and House District Committees and report and make their recommendations. Then let this House decide on daylight-saving time.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does not this bill expire on September 20? September 20 is not wintertime.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Even if it expires on September 20, it is still running into the winter. You know that daylight comes later in those months. But whatever time it may come, you are putting a burden upon the people who have to send their children to school and upon the workingman who has to get up early in the morning, and on the farmer who has to get his produce to the market when the market opens. He would have to get up before daylight to do that. Do not tell me that it does not affect the entire Nation, because it does.

Mr. BREHM. The workingmen with whom I have talked are in favor of it because it gives them more time to spend in their gardens and to do work around their homes after their regular day's work is finished. Since it ends on September 20, it would not interfere with children going to school in the dark.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If you would speak to a few of them, they might say they are in favor of it, but if you put daylight-saving time into effect and then ask them how they like it, they would tell you that they do not like it at all.

Mr. BREHM. Does not the gentleman believe in giving the people of the District of Columbia the right to make their own decisions on this question?

Mr. HENDRICKS. They are not making their own decision.

Mr. BREHM. Yes; they are.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If the people would make their own decision, that would be different. All you are doing is to tell the Commissioners to do what they want, and do not tell me that the Commissioners will not do what they please, as they have in the past. Just as has been pointed out by some of the other speakers here, the people have expressed themselves to the Commissioners in the past, and the Commissioners still do exactly as they please.

Mr. BREHM. I have more confidence in the Commissioners than that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here you have a very interesting amendment. We have been trying for quite some time to dispose of this issue of daylight-saving time and to do it on the basis of home rule by conferring upon the Commissioners the power to hold a hearing and then make a determination. Now, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted the Wadsworth amendment which permits those who live in adjoining areas to come in and be heard so that it would not be an ex parte proceeding. Now comes the gentleman from Florida who says in his amendment that after the hearing and after the Commissioners



make a finding they should report their finding to the District Committees of the House and Senate. So, the Commissioners—he mentions two when, as a matter of fact, there are three—will report to the House District Committee and to the Senate District Committee. Then, the committees will have to convene and dispose of the findings one way or another and work out some kind of procedure that is not yet apparent to me and bring the matter back here to go through the same identical proceedings that we have before us this afternoon.

Now, that is a beautiful piece of circumlocution and if you want to eviscerate a bill, that would be a fine way of doing it. I suggest that we vote down the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 121, noes 82.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-one Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 145, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—218

Abernethy	Andrews, N. Y.	Bakewell
Albert	Angell	Banta
Allen, Calif.	Arends	Bates, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Battle

Beall	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mills
Bennett, Mich.	Hagen	Monroney
Blackney	Hale	Morgan
Blatnik	Hall	Morrison
Bloom	Edwin Arthur	Muhlenberg
Boggs, Del.	Hall	Murdock
Boggs, La.	Leonard W.	Nixon
Boykin	Halleck	Norton
Bradley, Mich.	Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien
Bramblett	Harness, Ind.	O'Konski
Brehm	Hays	O'Toole
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Owens
Bryson	Hedrick	Pace
Buck	Herter	Patterson
Buffett	Heselton	Peden
Burleson	Hess	Peterson
Busbey	Hinshaw	Plumley
Butler	Holmes	Poage
Byrne, N. Y.	Hope	Potts
Canfield	Horan	Poulson
Carroll	Howell	Price, Fla.
Case, S. Dak.	Huber	Price, Ill.
Chadwick	Jarman	Priest
Chelf	Javits	Rabin
Chilperfield	Jenison	Ramey
Clason	Jenkins, Pa.	Rayfield
Coffin	Johnson, Calif.	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Jonkman	Reeves
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Rich
Cole, N. Y.	Karsten, Mo.	Riehlman
Combs	Kearney	Rivers
Corbett	Keating	Robertson
Cotton	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Coudert	Keefe	Rogers, Mass.
Courtney	Kelley	Rooney
Cravens	Kennedy	Ross
Crosser	Kilburn	Russell
Crow	Kilday	Sadlak
Dague	Klein	Sadowski
Davis, Tenn.	Kunkel	St. George
Dawson, Utah	Lea	Sarbacher
Deane	LeFevre	Sasscer
Delaney	Lodge	Seely-Brown
Devitt	Love	Sikes
Dingell	Lucas	Simpson, Pa.
Dirksen	Lyle	Smathers
Dondero	McConnell	Smith, Maine
Durham	McCormack	Snyder
Eberharter	McDonough	Stigler
Ellsworth	McDowell	Stockman
Elston	McGarvey	Stratton
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Sundstrom
Evins	McMahon	Teague
Fallon	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Feighan	MacKinnon	Tibbott
Fenton	Macy	Towse
Fernandez	Madden	Trimble
Fogarty	Mahon	Twyman
Foot	Maloney	Van Zandt
Forand	Manasco	Vorys
Fulton	Mansfield,	Walter
Gamble	Mont.	Whitten
Gearhart	Marcantonio	Whittington
Goff	Mathews	Wigglesworth
Goodwin	Meade, Md.	Wilson, Tex.
Gordon	Morrow	Winstead
Gore	Meyer	Wolverton
Gorski	Michener	Worley
Gossett	Miller, Nebr.	Youngblood
Grant, Ind.		

NAYS—145

Allen, La.	Cooper	Hull
Almond	Cox	Jackson, Wash.
Andersen	Crawford	Jenkins, Ohio
H. Carl	Cunningham	Jennings
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Ga.	Jensen
Andresen	D'Ewart	Johnson, Ill.
August H.	Dolliver	Johnson, Okla.
Andrews, Ala.	Dorn	Johnson, Tex.
Arnold	Doughton	Jones, Ala.
Barden	Eaton	Jones, N. C.
Barrett	Elliott	Jones, Ohio
Bates, Ky.	Engle, Calif.	Kerr
Beckworth	Fellows	Knutson
Bell	Flannagan	Lanham
Bennett, Mo.	Gary	Larcade
Bishop	Gillette	LeCompte
Bonner	Gillie	Lemke
Bradley, Calif.	Graham	Lesinski
Brooks	Grant, Ala.	Lewis
Brophy	Gregory	Lusk
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	McCowen
Burke	Gross	McMillan, S. C.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Camp	Hardy	Mason
Cannon	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Chapman	Harrison	Miller, Conn.
Chenoweth	Havener	Miller, Md.
Church	Hendricks	Morris
Clark	Hill	Mundt
Clevenger	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
Clippinger	Hoeven	Murray, Wis.
Colmer	Hoffman	Norblad
Cooley	Hollifield	Norrell

O'Hara	Rohrbough	Taber
Passman	Sabath	Talle
Phillips, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.	Thomas, Tex.
Phillips, Tenn.	Scrivner	Thomason
Pickett	Shaffer	Vursell
Rains	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Rankin	Short	Weichel
Rayburn	Simpson, Ill.	Welch
Redden	Smith, Kans.	West
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Ohio	Wheeler
Rees	Smith, Va.	Williams
Richards	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Riley	Spence	Wolcott
Rizley	Springer	Wood
Robison	Siefan	Woodruff
Rockwell	Stevenson	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—68

Bender	Gallagher	Mansfield, Tex.
Bland	Gathings	Meade, Ky.
Bolton	Gavin	Mitchell
Buchanan	Gerlach	Morton
Buckley	Gifford	Nodar
Bulwinkle	Granger	Padman
Carson	Hand	Pfeifer
Case, N. J.	Hart	Philbin
Celler	Hartley	Ploeser
Clements	Heffernan	Powell
Curtis	Jackson, Calif.	Preston
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Ind.	Sanborn
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Wash.	Schwabe, Mo.
Domengeaux	Kearns	Seablick
Donohue	Kefauver	Scott, Hardie
Douglas	Keogh	Scott.
Drewry	Kersten, Wis.	Hugh D., Jr.
Ellis	King	Somers
Elsaesser	Kirwan	Stanley
Fisher	Landis	Taylor
Fletcher	Lane	Tollefson
Folger	Latham	Vail
Fuller	Lynch	Vinson

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. D'Alesandro for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.

Mr. Folger for, with Mr. Gathings against.

Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Schwabe of Missouri against.

Mr. Nodar for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Landis against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Carson against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Jones of Washington against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Mansfield of Texas against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. Hand with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Preston.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Donohue.

Mr. Latham with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Gifford with Mr. Riley.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Granger.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. King.

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Kearns with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. ENGLE of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCES TO THREE INSPECTORS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE FOR USE OF PRIVATELY OWNED MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use

of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to allow not more than three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force an allowance for privately owned automobiles used by the inspectors in the performance of official duties at not to exceed \$480 per annum for each automobile used during the fiscal years 1945 and 1946 and thereafter to pay to not more than three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force who may be called upon to use privately owned automobiles in the performance of official duties for each automobile an allowance not to exceed \$480 per annum.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a quotation from a newspaper article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BRADLEY of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the City Council of Baltimore in support of an adequate merchant marine.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial or an article.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution by the Certified Public Accountants of Minnesota.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an act concerning displaced persons.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press.

#### PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have

until midnight tomorrow night to file minority views on the bill H. R. 3203.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that it may be transferred to Monday, May 5, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the Committee last had this joint resolution under consideration the first section of the resolution had been read.

The first section of the joint resolution is now open to amendment.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 1, line 4, after the words "not to exceed" strike out "\$350,000,000" and insert "\$200,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to strike out the authorization of \$350,000,000 and insert in place of it \$200,000,000. It is complementary to another amendment which I expect to offer to section 2 re-

ducing the term from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1947.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the two authorizations for UNRRA in the sum of \$1,350,000,000 each. I did that with some misgivings, but especially on the second authorization. At that time I offered an amendment that we give notice to the United Nations that at the end of this term the United States would withdraw from UNRRA. That was done because I felt that at some time this should become residual relief instead of what it promises to be—permanent relief year after year. I am concerned that that is what this bill contemplates at the present time; that is, that we are going permanently into the relief business, the only difference being that the United States is singly and alone taking over the burdens of UNRRA. I think I can point to the evidence which sustains that conclusion, and I want to examine with you the record and show that there will be no need for relief after 1947.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this amendment eliminate those countries that are Communist-controlled?

Mr. JONKMAN. No; it does not.

I do not see how any Member can consistently vote for relief through or in 1948 when all the evidence, the only thing that we have to guide us, shows that there will be no need for relief after 1947. We all know that the inspiration for this bill came from the General Assembly of the United Nations where continuation of UNRRA was considered and their recommendation at that time was 6 months of residual relief after the expiration of UNRRA on March 31, 1947, which would bring it up to October or until the next crop year.

Mr. Hoover recommends on page 55 of the hearings:

These estimates, except for Austria, in my view should first include the period from the end of UNRRA until the 1947 harvest.

President Truman in his message recommending this legislation said:

The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year.

That is on page 2 of the report.

Under Secretary of State Clayton said on page 13 of the hearings:

Question by Mr. JONKMAN. Is it your belief from present indications that they will have less acute need for 1948 than they will in 1947?

Answer by Mr. CLAYTON. Yes. They have made such progress in the last 2 years, considering the conditions under which they have had to live and work, remarkable progress in many of these countries, that if the progress should continue at the same rate at which it has gone in the last 2 years we believe, as I stated here, that the need for relief by the United States Government will have been met and passed by the end of this year. I refer to free relief, of course.

Mr. Acheson, Under Secretary of State, in a letter written and produced at the debate in the House of last week, April 23,



and, therefore, the last word on this subject, wrote:

Question. Is it intended that the amounts authorized in the bill will be adequate to take care of the relief need of the countries assisted to the end of the crop year 1948?

Answer. The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any evidence submitted before the gentleman's committee indicating that the problems of Europe today are more political than they are economic?

Mr. JONKMAN. Well, there is that indication. I repeat:

The amount requested is to assist in meeting the estimated relief needs for the calendar year 1947. In the actual operation of the program, some shipments may slip over into the first few months of 1948. With the possible exception of Austria—

Now, mind you, with the possible exception of Austria; not probable exception—

we do not anticipate that further relief will be necessary unless disastrous crop failures or other unforeseen events occur.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no other guide for us, there is no other evidence for us than that relief will not be needed in 1948.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. They have had ample opportunity to make two crops since the war closed. The war did not tear up their fields; it tore up the factories and the towns. With the exception of Germany, you might say, there has not been a gun fired across the soil of any country for 2 years, and there is no reason on earth why they should not have made crops, except that they have been harassed by a Communist regime or encouraged to beg help from us.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. But I want to emphasize what I was just saying. There is nothing else to guide you. The evidence positively shows that no relief will be needed after the end of 1947, and even the statement "with the possible exception of Austria" makes it stronger. They say they may need some limited relief; in other words, the other countries absolutely will not need it.

Now then, why do they ask for \$350,000,000 to run through 1948? There was \$100,000,000 in the budget to take care of 1947. I want you to look at the record and see what those who prepared this legislation had in mind.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman think we ought to make a difference between the Governments of Europe which are dominated by communism and those which are not dominated by communism?

Mr. JONKMAN. Well, it is most difficult to say that we are not going to go into those countries dominated by communism, if we can control this relief so that it goes to needy people without regard to creed, color, or race.

I ask you then, why do they ask for \$350,000,000 to run into 1948? What is the analysis of it? I will give it to you again from the record, from the evidence, from the only thing that we have to guide us in this matter. This is from the hearings:

Mr. VORYS. Then in addition to the \$500,000,000 of UNRRA products yet undelivered by UNRRA, I understand that \$100,000,000 of this \$350,000,000 to be authorized by this legislation would be the amount distributed up to June. Is that correct?

Mr. CLAYTON. That depends on how soon this \$350,000,000 would be available to us if at all, by Congress, and how quickly we could enter the procurement. The critical time, as I have said in my previous statement, is in the spring and summer before the harvest comes in.

That is the spring and summer that we are now in.

Therefore we would like to get the money as quickly as we can and start shipping wheat and other supplies as quickly as possible.

Mr. VORYS. I noted in the budget that \$100,000,000 of that was put in for fiscal year 1947.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is just an estimate, sir. We would like to spend more than that if we could in the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. VORYS. According to the budget, you would contemplate that \$250,000,000 would be distributed through 1948?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is the estimate we made; yes, sir.

In other words, they are going to spend \$250,000,000 in 1948 where there is no need of relief in 1948 according to all the testimony available.

Let us fortify that just a little further. Mr. Tyler Wood, Deputy to Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, said:

Mr. JARMAN. You spoke of the \$100,000,000 last November, and the acting chairman spoke of \$200,000,000. Are those figures in the budget?

I think that should be \$250,000.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, they are in the budget. They are on the expenditure budget, which is the \$37,500,000,000 that everybody is talking about, and the estimate is that of the \$350,000,000 that is in the budget, \$100,000,000 would actually be spent in the fiscal year 1947 and \$250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948.

In other words, we have the same thing there. They are contemplating expenditures into 1948 to the amount of \$250,000,000. I submit, however, why should they propose this when no relief is needed in 1948.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not hold them to the \$100,000,000 that was contemplated for 1947, that would carry them through the spring and early summer of 1947. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we could with consistency cut this authorization down to \$100,000,000, and that would meet the needs of 1947. That is what the evidence shows. But I am not asking for that. We propose to give them under this amendment \$200,000,-

000. That is up to the end of the year. On January 3, 1948, Congress will be in session. We have not yet seen, Mr. Chairman, how this replacement for UNRRA is going to work. We know that UNRRA worked very, very poorly. I dare say from what I have seen that if 10 to 20 percent of the \$2,750,000,000 that we put in there actually went to the needy people for food, medicine, seeds, and so forth, it is a high percentage. What assurance have we that this is going to be handled any better?

I hope my amendment will be adopted. It provides ample funds for the balance of the year 1947, and at the end of that time Congress will be in session if further help is needed.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are all well aware of the fact that this House is so large that it is utterly impossible for it to function as a strictly deliberative body. We fully realize the impossibility of 435 Members sitting in this Chamber and discussing an item of legislation. Why, we would never get through. It would even take us more time than is required in another place I know of to pass legislation. Therefore that realization requires us to rely very heavily on the committees of the House. One specializes in foreign affairs, one on the armed forces, and one on appropriations. We naturally and properly look to the Appropriations Committee on matters germane to it. We look to the Committee on Armed Forces on matters of defense. It is equally natural for us to look to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on matters of foreign relations. But regardless of which committee it be, the only way the committee can bring the results of its work to the House is in a report. These circumstances place a heavy responsibility on the committees to make sure that the reports speak the truth, of course, the same responsibility rests on the shoulders of those who submit minority reports.

We have in this case a very strong majority report and a strong minority report. The minority report is signed by three able members of that committee, three very fine gentlemen of whom I am personally quite fond. I want to read the two concluding paragraphs of that minority report:

We propose to offer amendments which will reduce the authorization of this bill to \$200,000,000 and provide that no transfers of supplies or establishments of credits may be made thereunder after December 31, 1947.

This will more nearly meet all the considerations which a judicious approach would recommend and which is adequate to accomplish the desired result if distribution is made with reasonable diligence.

That is what the minority report says, my friends, from which this amendment results with which the majority of the committee, and I mean the majority of both Republicans and Democrats, are in complete disagreement.

I quote again from that same minority report, on page 9:

Finally, the State Department has not made any on-the-spot check of the needs in

these countries. It does not know whether there is scarcity—

Remember these words—

whether there is scarcity in Warsaw or Athens; and if so, which of the two has the greatest scarcity.

Now, I read from page 86 of the hearings. Bear in mind that word "Warsaw."

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was asking a question of the representative of the State Department, Mr. Wood, and he said:

Mr. Hoover made a great deal of the importance of having on-the-spot investigations and studies by qualified experts in the field of relief. As I understand your answer to Mr. JARMAN's question, those on-the-spot investigations have not yet taken place in any of these countries.

Mr. Wood. No; I did not mean to give that impression. They have been continuous.

Mr. MUNDT. No special missions have been sent over to make a specific study leading up to this?

Mr. Wood. There have been continuous investigations by the people in the embassies in these countries, in addition to which there was this investigation, on which we had really expert people, made by the Devastated Areas Subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Of course I will have to yield to the gentleman—I am talking about him. But if he would let me proceed I might compliment him even more highly.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does the gentleman mean by that last statement the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations made on-the-spot investigations?

Mr. JARMAN. I am reading from the hearings. I believe I reached the point where I said investigation was made by the Devastated Areas Subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is the United Nations organization.

Mr. JARMAN. Oh, yes; "on which we had really expert people." If the gentleman will permit me to proceed—my time is very limited.

There has not been in these countries a formal investigating committee from the outside, but let me assure you that, for example, we went into Poland this summer and Ambassador Lane and his whole staff were spending a great deal of time, not only in Warsaw, but all over the country, looking at the condition of the crops and interviewing people in various places.

Now, my friends, I submit to you the considered opinion—and I may be wrong, but if I am, I am subject to being challenged—that I do not believe that evidence is controverted anywhere in the hearings. Therefore, I do not believe there appears to be anything in the hearing to substantiate the positive statement

of the minority report that no on-the-spot investigations occurred. On the other hand, it is directly contradicted by the testimony. If that be true, who is the House of Representatives to follow—the three gentlemen who signed this minority report or the Democrats and Republicans who agree to the majority report? The former express the opinion in the same report in which they say no on-the-spot investigation occurred, that \$200,000,000 will prove adequate; whereas the latter will, I am sure, reiterate the position they took when voting this amendment down in committee.

In conclusion, may I repeat that I have only the highest regard for those three gentlemen. I do not believe they would deliberately attempt to mislead this House. On the other hand, as I said last week, we are all so thoroughly occupied that frequently we do not have time to go into these matters, to study them from all angles as I know these three gentlemen would have done had time been available to them. In that event they never would have placed that statement in the report.

In view of that statement, how can we have too much confidence in their recommendation that \$200,000,000 would be adequate?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. VORYS:

Mr. VORYS moves to amend House Joint Resolution 153 as follows:

Strike out the Jonkman amendment and at the end of section 1 add the following: "there is hereby established a joint committee on International Relief consisting of five Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore, and five Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"It shall be the duty of the joint committee to study relief needs in foreign countries and the ability of the United States to furnish relief; the President shall keep the joint committee advised of foreign relief needs and the measures he is taking to relieve such needs and all expenditures in excess of \$200,000,000 from the appropriations herein authorized shall have the approval of the joint committee. Such approval may be given in detail or in gross amounts as the joint committee shall deem advisable."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute as another way of solving the problem presented by my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. I offered the amendment to cut the amount of the authorization to \$200,000,000 in committee. In the meantime, time has been going by. I have seen how kleidoscopic and unpredictable the changes in Europe and in our relations with Europe make the future. I therefore propose the suggestion which carries out the suggestion made by Mr. Hoover before our committee.

If you will look at the hearings on page 57, you will find Mr. Hoover said:

There is no mortal man who can determine what the requirements of those

various nations are going to be after the next harvest and determine the requirement of each nation after harvest, at the present time.

Therefore, he suggested that a small committee of Congress be set up to review the needs after the next harvest. Remember, this is only an authorization bill. The Committee on Appropriations will have to do the appropriating. But only God knows what the needs are going to be in those countries next fall after their harvests are in, and what our ability will be to fulfill those needs after our harvests are in. Therefore, this amendment would provide for a review by an appropriate joint congressional committee on relief. All expenditures over \$200,000,000 would have to be approved by this committee.

Now, let us face the practical facts. We are hopeful that the Congress will be in recess this fall. Therefore, the Congress will not be here to review the authorization. If we have a program that runs up to December 31, it is not contemplated that the Congress will be in session in December. This authorization continues through fiscal year 1948, but the proposal has been made that it may be spent in 1947. Only God knows the needs. We know something about the needs, on the Foreign Affairs Committee, but, as I explained the other day, due to the way this was presented to us, only 6 of the 12 days of hearings are before you. The secret documents which gave the needs and the proposed distribution are not before us and, therefore, we cannot intelligently discuss this. But it seems to me that, patterning this after a similar joint committee that has been in effect for some years, we can do a good job. The Foreign Service Building Committee is made up of Members of Congress from the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This is provided in the Foreign Service Buildings Commission law, title 22, section 293, United States Code. That joint committee must approve, even though appropriations are made, before an embassy can be put up on foreign soil.

Under the proposed substitute I offer, a joint committee which would obviously be made up of a majority of the party in power in Congress would have to approve all expenditures after the first \$200,000,000. If we adopted this we would have bipartisan power and responsibility in carrying out this policy in that we would have the Executive proposing the expenditures and the committee, a majority of which would be Republicans, approving these expenditures. I am sure the committee would approve them if the funds were necessary. In the event the expenditure were not necessary I am sure that such a committee would prevent needless expenditure.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Do we understand from the gentleman's amendment that this proposed committee is to be appointed from the membership of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and



the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House?

Mr. VORYS. The amendment merely provides that the Speaker shall appoint five members and the President of the Senate shall appoint five. Where they are to come from is left to the wisdom of these Presiding Officers. I imagine that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House would be represented heavily. There might be members from the Appropriations Committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that in advocating the type of check the gentleman has in mind in offering this amendment, Mr. Hoover likewise recommended that the sum of \$350,000,000 be left intact?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Hoover suggested that this sort of control would leave the authorization intact subject to appropriation, but would permit a congressional string to it in case the money were not needed, and would also give congressional power and responsibility to make this relief truly a bipartisan proceeding.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Was this amendment proposed in the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What was the result?

Mr. VORYS. It lost.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. By how many votes?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for an administrator?

Mr. VORYS. That will be proposed in an amendment to be offered later.

Mr. HERTER. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to make it clear that the United States is preparing to contribute up to \$350,000,000 if it is needed; but there is not any sense in actually spending it unless it is spent after investigation and that investigation proves that it is actually needed.

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

This is only an authorization bill, but this will help the Appropriations Committee, which would not be permitted to put any such legislative restriction in an appropriation bill in connection with any appropriation made beyond \$200,000,000; but if the Appropriations Committee is so disposed it would be subject to the control of this congressional relief committee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. What assurance have we that any other nation in the world other than this Nation will make any

contribution to this money that we are proposing to spend?

Mr. VORYS. We have no assurance at all.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am talking about the percentage. What I want to know is if we have any assurance that any other nation on earth will make any contribution.

Mr. VORYS. We know that the British are going to lend \$40,000,000 in Austria, but due to the fact that no treaty has been had in the case of Austria it is doubtful in my mind whether Austria will come into this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 153, and I think it should be passed without amendment. I shall endeavor to develop my reasons for this statement.

Whereas I agree with my distinguished colleague from Ohio in that we should have a committee to study the way in which this money is to be spent, I believe that is part of a larger problem. For a long time I have been asking that there be a select committee of 23 Members appointed to make a full study of foreign policy, both economic and political, in every country and with full power to investigate the Department of State and the Foreign Service. So far as the committee suggested by my distinguished colleague is concerned, I believe it would be a subject for legislation other than House Joint Resolution 153.

Mr. Chairman, nobody has been any more outspoken against communism than I. I would vigorously oppose the spending of American money if in any way it could be used to advance communism and to assist Moscow-controlled governments. If this resolution were to continue UNRRA, I would strenuously oppose the measure. In the summer of 1945 I witnessed the UNRRA operations in western Europe and the Balkans. While in this area and particularly in Belgrade, the capital of the Moscow-Tito-dominated Yugoslavia, I learned that UNRRA was being used to advance the fortunes of the Communist Party. In an effort to focus attention on the misuse of UNRRA funds I introduced on October 10, 1945, House Resolution 369 to set up a committee to make an investigation of UNRRA.

#### UNDER SECRETARY CLAYTON'S ASSURANCES

The joint resolution under discussion provides for unilateral relief action by the United States to prevent starvation. It is "based on the principle that relief of this kind is for people in need, and that these unfortunate people cannot be allowed to suffer from hunger because of the nature of their governments."

On February 25, 1947, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. Clayton, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee at the opening of the hearing on this measure. Fearing that the proposed relief might be used by Russian-controlled governments to advance communism, I said to Mr. Clayton:

I just do not see how we are going to send relief, for instance, to Hungary, and par-

ticularly Poland, where there is Soviet-dominated government and let that government distribute the relief, without advancing the Communist Party in those countries. That is what happened under UNRRA, as near as I can find out, and that is what worries me about this situation. I think if Russia is going to dominate those countries she had better help feed them.

To this Mr. Clayton replied in the following manner:

Mr. MERROW, may I say just a few words on that: Of course Hungary is hungry, and starving people are starving people wherever you might find them, under what conditions of government or otherwise. However, I think, under the conditions which we will name in these agreements, you may be sure that the people getting this relief will know where it comes from and who is supplying it, that it will be distributed without discrimination, and that the purpose we have in mind will be accomplished to prevent starvation in these countries.

#### PROPOSED AGREEMENTS

In the appendix of the hearings, page 125, there is a statement by Mr. C. Tyler Wood, Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, concerning the agreements referred to by Mr. Clayton to be made between the United States and relief-recipient countries. Under 13 headings Mr. Wood has outlined the agreements referred to by the Under Secretary. I quote only part of his statement:

The agreements will provide for reports covering (a) prompt notice of arrival of United States supplies, (b) the allocation of those supplies to commercial and other channels and the quantity of supplies used for free distribution, (c) current inventories of all supplies available for relief, and (d) forecasts of local supplies which will become available; the agreements will provide that the United States representatives will be completely free to observe, inspect, and travel at any and all times as they consider necessary, and the full cooperation of the Government in providing them with information, statistics, and reports; the agreements will provide that representatives of the United States press and radio will be given complete freedom to observe and report on the relief distribution; the agreements will provide that the recipient governments will arrange for publicity regarding the arrival of United States supplies, the channels of distribution, any unusual features of the distribution of supplies, and the utilization of funds accruing from sales of supplies for the benefit of the people; the agreements on this subject will give the United States control of the program at all times and provide a powerful means of enforcing compliance with United States wishes concerning the distribution; since conditions vary from country to country, it is possible that other provisions will be necessary to insure proper conduct and effectiveness of distribution in some particular country.

#### REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 3

In section 3 of the resolution it is expressly stated:

No relief assistance shall be provided under the authority of this joint resolution to the people of any country unless the government of such country has given assurance satisfactory to the President that (a) the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, as well as similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, will be distributed among the people of such country without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (b) representatives of the Gov-

ernment of the United States and of the press and radio of the United States will be permitted to observe freely and to report fully regarding the distribution and utilization of such supplies; (c) full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution; (d) if food, medical supplies, fertilizer, or seed is transferred or otherwise made available to such country pursuant to this joint resolution, no articles of the same character will be exported or removed from such country while need therefor for relief purposes continues; (e) such country has taken or is taking, insofar as possible, the economic measures necessary to reduce its relief needs and to provide for its own future reconstruction; (f) upon request of the President, it will furnish promptly information concerning the production, use, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief needs of the people of such country; and (g) representatives of the Government of the United States will be permitted to supervise the distribution among the people of such country of the supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution.

CONFIDENCE IN STATE DEPARTMENT TO  
ADMINISTER THIS RELIEF

The conditions set forth in section 3 of this measure in addition to the assurances of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and the proposed agreements as outlined by Mr. Wood satisfy me that this money will be spent to prevent starvation and that in no way will it be used to further the interests of the Communist Party. For a long time I have been asking for a select committee to study foreign policy and to study the Department of State and the Foreign Service. I have been requesting such a study not in an attempt to hunt witches but to improve the State Department. I have confidence in Mr. Clayton and his associates and I believe that they will conscientiously carry out the provisions of the resolution and will fulfill the pledges they have made in reference to the agreements they propose to make with relief recipient countries.

TERMINATION

Furthermore House Resolution 153 provides that the President shall terminate relief assistance whenever by reason of changed conditions the provision of relief assistance provided by this joint resolution is no longer necessary, whenever the assurances of section 3 are not being carried out and whenever any supplies made available under this resolution or similar supplies produced locally or imported from the outside is being used for the maintenance of the armed forces in such country and whenever similar supplies produced locally or imported from the outside are being removed from such countries. Furthermore, the joint resolution can be terminated by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

SAFEGUARDS ADEQUATE

I believe the safeguards in this bill are adequate to insure the proper use of the funds provided. The measure has been carefully prepared and does not need to be amended. I believe that this aid is necessary to complement the aid we are going to give to Greece and Turkey. We are determined to prevent the spread of

communism and one of the most effective ways to do this is to aid starving people in devastated countries. The rigid requirements which must be met before relief can be furnished to these countries will guarantee that the American taxpayers' money will not be used to bolster Moscow-controlled governments in nations such as Poland and Hungary. I hope this measure passes by a substantial majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Inasmuch as the gentleman stated that he does not want any amendment, and I have an amendment at the desk, I would like to ask the gentleman if he can state what the constitutional authority for this \$350,000,000 gift is?

Mr. MERROW. We have a constitutional right to appropriate any money that we desire for relief to any country.

Mr. OWENS. There is nothing in the Constitution on it. That is why I have the amendment. We cannot depend on it.

Mr. MERROW. We have done it before.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the constitutionality is found in the power of the Congress to appropriate money for the general welfare.

Mr. OWENS. That is the amendment I have at the desk, but I do not believe it is sufficient without the specific amendment in the bill.

Mr. MERROW. There has been no provision like this before.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question of constitutional authority.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think we ought to put this matter over until tomorrow, until after we hear General Marshall?

Mr. MERROW. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the measure ought to go over at least until we hear General Marshall tonight.

Mr. MERROW. I have no objection but I hope the measure passes.

YOU CANNOT TRUST A COMMUNIST

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I announced the other day, I will not vote for a single dime to go to any country that is Communist-dominated, for a gang of commissars to steal, misuse, and starve the helpless women and children in those countries.

I live in a country that once lost a war. I think I can refer back to that tragic era without in any way offending the sensibilities of anyone. There never lived greater soldiers in time of war, or greater citizens in time of peace than those brave men who wore the gray in that unfortunate conflict known as the Civil War, or the War Between the States.

When that war closed those men came home and tied their empty sleeves to the plow lines and began making their own way. I know because I saw it 25 years after the war closed. I have seen a one-legged ex-Confederate soldier leaning on his hoe for a crutch and cultivating his field, hoeing cotton, or cutting sugarcane.

One of the leading businessmen of the country in which I live told me that he plowed the milk cow the first year after the war closed.

Their horses were gone, and in many cases their outhouses, and even their homes, had been burned. There was hardly a home but had lost a son, and a large percentage of the ones who survived had been severely wounded.

They got no assistance from anyone, they were unable to do so; yet they struggled on, developed the strongest stamina ever known, and taught it to their children. It has been the savior of the Southern States for the last 80 years.

They were men, take them for all in all. We shall not look upon their likes again.

This war has been over 2 years, and the peoples of Europe have had ample time to make two full crops.

In the fall of 1945 the greatest soldier developed in this war, Gen. George S. Patton, came here to see me. He came by to thank me for defending him on this floor, as he expressed it, "When I was on the battlefield and could not defend myself."

He said, "Why are you people getting ready to feed Germany?" He said, "I have been all over Germany, and they have the finest crops I ever saw." That was in the fall of 1945. He said, "We didn't shoot up the fields, we shot up the towns and the factories and the cities."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say as one who traveled over Germany in the summer of 1945 that I can confirm exactly what General Patton said.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Last year I told another general, who was with General Patton, what General Patton had said, and asked him why the people were asking for help. He said, "The trouble is, the Communists went in there and drove off their livestock, and took their farm machinery," just as they will take this money if we pour it into those countries that the Communists dominate.

I am certainly going to vote for the amendment to be offered by my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to deny this money to any country that is Communist-dominated.



Communism is not a form of government; it is a criminal conspiracy to overthrow every government in the world, including the United States. I read that to you from their own lips on this floor a few days ago. But, if you continue to go down into the pockets of the American people and pour money into those countries, I am not sure they will ever make a crop. They tell us that we have absolutely killed, in large measure, the desire of a great many people of Europe to become self-sustaining with the money we have already poured into those countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. The United States of America won this war, Mr. Chairman. We won it with our men, our money, and our material. We are today staggering under a burden of debt the like of which no other nation on earth ever saw or could survive. If you were to reduce price levels to what they were 15 years ago, the entire wealth of this Nation would not be sufficient to pay the public debt. It is about time that we take those things into consideration, and not be continuously pouring money by the hundreds of millions of dollars into areas where it promotes indolence and encourages people to hold out their hands and beg for the American taxpayers' money.

I read portions of General Morgan's report. UNRRA was a farce. The money provided was used to finance a lot of "joyriders" of a minority group, while they let many of the Christian women and children starve to death.

Now, you come along and ask for this \$350,000,000. Next week you are going to ask for \$400,000,000 to try to stop communism in Greece and Turkey. As I said before, if we are going to fight communism, let us begin on Capitol Hill. Let us begin in the House Office Building. Let us begin in the Senate Office Building and in the Library of Congress. Let us go down through the War Department, the State Department, and the Treasury Department, and every other department of this Government, and drive these Reds out of our Government. Then let us drive them from our educational institutions where they are poisoning the minds of the youth of America, and drive them from the radio where they are insidiously pumping poisonous propaganda into the ears of the unsuspecting men, women, and children of America. Let us clean them out of our picture shows where they are spreading before the youth of the land the insidious Communist lines that are undermining the moral fabric of America and destroying those things for which our forefathers fought, and for which our young men were told they were fighting in this war.

If we are going to fight communism, no man on earth will go farther than I will. But we cannot afford to fight it at one place and feed it at another.

Therefore, I think we should carry this bill over at least until we hear General Marshall tonight, and we should probably postpone it indefinitely. Certainly, we should adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to provide that not a dollar of this money, not a dime of it, shall go to a Communist-dominated country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman saw in this morning's Times-Herald the statement by John O'Donnell where he points out in a quotation from a letter, that he received from some veteran down in Newport News, the names of the Russian ships that are there now loading the so-called UNRRA materials and heavy machinery and trucks and things of that kind.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not surprised.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do you not think this is a little inconsistent for us to be considering a measure like this until that sort of thing is stopped?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly. Some of those countries to which UNRRA assistance was furnished, Yugoslavia, for instance, took it to build up their armed forces and then with the very guns that we furnished them shot down, murdered our aviators in cold blood and buried them without notifying the American authorities.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman for a question as the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. MERROW. I compliment the gentleman on the splendid fight that he has always made against communism. I want to say frankly that I would oppose a measure which would send materials to Communist-dominated countries if it did not contain certain restrictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Subsection (c) of section 2 on page 4 of the bill says:

Full and continuous publicity will be given within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of the United States relief program carried on therein pursuant to this joint resolution.

I doubt if the Soviet-dominated governments of Hungary and Poland would agree to that.

Section 5 of the bill states that—

The President shall promptly terminate the provision of relief assistance to the people of any country whenever he determines . . . that supplies transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this joint resolution, or similar supplies produced locally or imported from outside sources, are being exported or removed from such country.

If the people of the countries in question know that the relief comes from the

United States will it not help us fight communism?

Mr. RANKIN. I doubt it. In the first place, I would not believe a word a Communist would say. He does not believe in God. He is an atheist, and no obligation would bind him. Anything a Communist would sign would not be worth the paper it is written on. I do not care what they tell you about getting this money under their control, or this food and material. They will do just as they please with it and then lie to us about it.

Get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, turn to page A1895 of the Appendix, and read the report on the Soviet spy ring and their traitorous operations in this country, in Canada, and in Great Britain, in flagrant violation of every obligation they have signed and every promise they have made.

Former Ambassador to Russia Hon. William C. Bullitt told the Committee on Un-American Activities that in his deliberate opinion if the Russians had the atomic bomb and we did not have it they would have dropped it on us long ago.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Anyway, it would be distributed through this Government, would it not?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, of course. If we are going to feed the hungry people of Europe, we should do it through the International Red Cross.

The American Treasury is not inexhaustible. The American taxpayers are not inexhaustible, although they have gone a long way further than any other country that ever existed in answering the appeals of people of other lands. In my opinion, we have gone further than we were justified in going in many instances.

I am not in favor of taking any chances on sending money into Communist countries or sending food into Communist countries, to be taken over and used by those Communist regimes that would use it to overthrow every other government in the world, including our own, undermine and destroy our way of life, and wreck our entire Christian civilization.

I think it is dangerous, and I am opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jonkman amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all, I congratulate this body on the close attention it is paying to the discussion dealing with the problems presented in this bill. I think it has seldom been true that a bill has come before you which required more careful attention, because, if for no other reason, the march of events and time since the date this was reported from the com-

mittee has changed some of the fundamental considerations.

On the face of these hearings you will notice they were held February 25, 26, 27, 28, March 3, 4, 5, and 6. The history of the world has changed since March 12, because that was the day that President Truman came before us and delivered his message concerning the Greek-Turkish situation. So much of the testimony which took place in support of this bill is obsolete today, due to the fact that the march of events has come along and changed it and made it antique and archaic.

I think this bill should be amended. I think it should be amended by the Members of this body this afternoon and tomorrow. I think we can tighten it up. I think we can improve it. Certainly, in view of what has transpired since March 12, I think we can save the \$150,000,000 which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] proposes to save in his amendment, where it would reduce the over-all figure from \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000.

May I point out especially to my Republican brethren who have had considerable to say about economy at this session, President Truman appealed to this Congress to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947 for the purposes provided in this bill. We now propose to double President Truman's recommendation, making it \$200,000,000 for the calendar year 1947, under the Jonkman proposal. If you go along with the bill as originally presented, or if you go along with the bill as it will remain if the Vorys amendment is adopted, or if it goes through without any amendment, you are voting to appropriate three and one-half times as much as President Truman recommended in his annual budget message. I think we should consider this bill in view of what has happened in the world since the request was originally made. I would have favored the \$350,000,000 total had it not been that on March 12 the President proposed this new \$400,000,000 program, a program which I expect to support, a program which I think is now essential to peace and security, but a program which in large part overlaps, duplicates, and underscores the same program for which we are now voting \$350,000,000 unless you accept the Jonkman amendment.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think this House is entitled to know what the policy of the Government is in connection with the supplying of Russia with UNRRA supplies in the nature of trucks and heavy machinery, and also lend-lease material that could be used against us at a time when we are trying to stop communism by helping Greece and Turkey?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly do.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. What I wish to know is why we should not be told whether they are going to stop the shipment of lend-lease materials and UNRRA materials in the nature of heavy equipment, machinery that could be used for

the very purpose of doing the thing they ask us to do, stop Communism over in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will support the Jonkman amendment he will at least make sure that the remaining \$150,000,000 which will become available in the calendar year 1948 will not be made available unless and until they stop that. The decision is in the gentleman's hands and in the hands of his colleagues this afternoon.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I am going to support the amendment, but I want to know whether when we get the \$400,000,000 bill for which they asked a rule today we are going to continue as we did before the war started, shipping hundreds of millions of dollars of scrap to Japan. The gentleman from South Dakota and I both fought the idea, but our views did not prevail. Are we going to do the same identical foolish thing and continue to ship all this material to Russia at a time when they ask us to put \$400,000,000 over in Turkey and Greece to stop Russia?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman understands, of course, that the time to make that fight will be in connection with the \$400,000,000 bill for Greece and Turkey. I shall do all I can to see that we do not follow policies which are opposed to each other, one of which would undo the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I make this reservation to propound this inquiry of the Chair: Is there any way we can find out now whether or not this debate is going to be very limited and after a few moments a motion be made that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be concluded? Because there are a lot of us who want to speak on this proposal. I want to speak on it myself.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned this debate ought to be unlimited. Every Member of the House ought to have an opportunity to express himself.

I hope every Member will get the May issue of the Reader's Digest and read about the Russian spy ring in this country as reported on page 127 of the May issue. If he does, then tomorrow he will feel just as I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of making an inquiry, whether the Chair is about to state that as far as the Chair is concerned time for debate, like relief, will be unlimited?

The CHAIRMAN. As far as the Chair is concerned, it is, of course, unlimited; but such remarks should be addressed to the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill.

The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I shall be happy to yield. I believe the gentleman who first addressed me was the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. I am sure the gentleman did not intend to confuse the Congress in regard to President Truman's position in this matter. It is a fact that the President has asked the Congress for a \$350,000,000 authorization, is it not?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct, \$100,000,000 for 1947, and \$250,000,000 for the remainder of the program.

Mr. RICHARDS. No. I wish to ask the gentleman this: Is not the President's recommendation that this Congress provide \$350,000,000 for relief this year, but he does not specify that any part of it is to be provided for 1947 and the other part for 1948?

Mr. MUNDT. The budget message which spells out exactly what he has in mind this year provides \$100,000,000 for 1947 and \$250,000,000 for the remainder of the program.

During the hearings, as the gentleman knows, there was some confusion on the part of the State Department as to how much they would be able to spend during the remainder of this calendar year, some even believing we could not spend \$150,000,000 during the remainder of this year. Under the Jonkman amendment, however, we can spend \$200,000,000 during the calendar year 1947, which is more than the most optimistic witness before the Committee believed they could spend in so short a time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is not the gentleman confusing this request for relief and the budget estimate for relief in the occupied countries of Europe?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think so, because, as the gentleman knows, the estimate for the occupied countries goes to the Appropriations Committee and not to our committee, because it is handled by the Army.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to clear up what the gentleman means about this \$100,000,000 proposed by the President. The President has asked this Congress through the present authorization to provide \$350,000,000 for relief in six particular countries. None of these countries is occupied territory.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right, except for Austria.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will refer to the Budget he will see most of the relief mentioned there refers to funds needed for relief in countries occupied by our own forces, such as Japan, Korea, and Germany.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a tremendously greater figure than the \$350,000,000. That runs close to a billion dollars and will be administered by the Army. I do not want to yield to the gentleman further. He may get his own time to discuss that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.



Mr. COX. In view of the fact the bill is drawn in such language as to make certain that the Communists shall get the lion's share of the fund, does the gentleman not find it inconsistent with this later suggestion of extending aid to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. MUNDT. No. I do not think you can say that this bill is drawn so that the lion's share will go to the Communists. If the gentleman will support, as I feel confident he will, amendments which are to be offered by members of our committee, we are going to tighten this bill up so none of it will go to the Communists.

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman and his colleagues will make certain to write into the bill all of the recommendations made by ex-President Hoover.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. We propose to bring them up one by one so none of this relief can go to help communism. If we fail to do that, and if under maladministrative practices the aid should go to fatten the Communists, we will of course be in a strange position of incongruity after passing the Greek-Turk bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have a high regard for the gentleman's study and judgment on this problem. Why does not the Vorys amendment, in the gentleman's opinion, give every protection which the Jonkman amendment gives and still take care of the possibility of meeting the larger demands?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because I want to discuss it. In the first place I am one Member of Congress who is opposed to having the lower House of Congress delegate its authority and responsibility anywhere. I have opposed it as we have been repeatedly asked to delegate it to the White House. I have opposed it when we have been repeatedly asked to delegate it to the State Department. I am opposing it when we are now asked to delegate it to a small committee to be set up, as the Vorys amendment would propose, and delegating the responsibility of the Members of Congress to a committee which acts without authority, because we would then have authorized the full \$350,000,000. Only the Jonkman amendment cuts it down specifically to \$250,000,000. If we authorize the entire \$350,000,000 that becomes a Congressional directive to the Appropriations Committee to make the full amount available. On the other hand the Jonkman amendment reduces that directive to a \$200,000,000 expenditure. Congress will be in session again next year. If it should develop the other \$150,000,000 is needed next year we could then authorize and appropriate it. According to former President Hoover, however, no more than \$200,000,000 and perhaps less can be spent effectively and helpfully during the remainder of 1947. It thus seems wise to limit this bill as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] proposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to ask our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] this question: As I understand the momentary situation, the gentleman from Michigan has an amendment at the desk cutting the \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has an amendment before us calling for the appointment of a commission to consist of five men.

Mr. JONKMAN. Not as an amendment. As a substitute.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a substitute. That is what I want to clear up. In other words, the Vorys amendment would leave the \$350,000,000 in the bill, is that correct?

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of what I understand will be the Colmer amendment. That is to put provisions in the bill that will prohibit the so-called communistic countries from receiving any of this money. I do not propose to cast my vote in favor of any such contribution. To do so would be an insult to my own intelligence and an insult to the good people of my district who pay taxes and buy bonds with which to furnish the Treasury the dollars with which to make these extensions of credit, or grants, or gifts, or whatever you want to call them. We are either fighting communism or we are supporting it. As I understand the proposal which will come before us in a few days to give aid to Greece and Turkey, relief to Greece and finances to equip Turkey with a great, strong, modernized, fully-equipped army to fight Russia, if necessary, I see no sense in giving the so-called communistic countries relief money at the same time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. About 4 hours ago I had lunch with one of the most prominent newsmen of this city who just returned from Europe after having been there 4 months. His conclusion is that it would be ridiculous on the part of the United States to furnish relief or money to countries dominated by the Communists.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And I think "ridiculous" is too mild a word for it. I would like to say exactly what I think, but it would not be permissible to print it in the Record.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Three or four days ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report that is in the May Reader's Digest of the Communist spy ring, the Soviet spy ring in this country. If any of you think you can deal with a Communist country, get the Reader's Digest, or turn to the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read that report, and you will see that you might as well attempt to tame a rattlesnake or pet a hyena.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to emphatically go on record in favor of the Jonkman amendment to reduce this \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000. I regret that the Vorys amendment is not in such shape that I can vote for it, but if it is to serve as a substitute, leaving the \$350,000,000 in the bill, then I cannot support the Vorys amendment. If the Vorys amendment is offered independent of the Jonkman amendment I shall certainly support an amendment providing for a commission consisting of 10 men, 5 from this body and 5 from the other body to be created to supervise the expenditures of these funds. I do not propose to vote for any bill of this nature unless there is language put in the bill which gives the people of this country some supervision over the distribution of these funds. I prefer to go back home to my district this summer and next summer and stand there and tell my good people that at least I tried to protect their funds by keeping these grants and gifts under the supervision of the people of the United States instead of giving blank checks to all of the other people of the earth.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I was just thinking, in view of the past history, it might be well to allocate a certain amount of these funds to the Turks to be used only for cutting the throats of the Armenians, which they have done through the ages.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They might do something of that kind.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the gentleman is a little bit confused with reference to the administration of funds in this bill. All of this money will be spent, and the regulations will be written by our own Government. This is entirely different from the funds administered by UNRRA. UNRRA was under an international organization.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that very well, and I do not think the language in this bill goes far enough, and I shall support such amendments as may be offered in that general direction.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if I pretend to be anything at all in this life, it is to be a realist. I like to view problems realistically, and in order to do that I like to know the facts, and one of the troubles that I have found as a Member of this House in dealing with matters emanating from the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs has always been a deep-seated conviction that the House, as a House of Representatives, has never had all of the facts. And I

know of no bill that has ever come before this House where that fact is so apparent as the bill now under consideration, because it has been conceded by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who brought here the secret files of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, giving the record before that committee held in executive sessions. So the members of the committee like the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] can stand up here and tell the Members, "Now, you other Members of Congress aren't supposed to know all the facts about this thing. You rely upon your committee."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. He did not say it in that language, but he gave in substance that type of advice here just a little while ago. I say to the gentleman it is pretty fair advice, but what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. As part of this debate, I want to say to the gentleman that I would like to see him conform to that advice in other days. It notice that he did not support the committee the other day when the vote on the Interior Department appropriation bill was before the House. He went off onto a tangent by himself. But when State Department matters are here or Foreign Affairs matters are here, the ordinary Member of Congress is supposed to sit by meekly and humbly and just adopt wisdom from the people of the Foreign Affairs Committee who have been privileged in their secret sessions to hear all the stuff that is given to them spoon-fed by the people from the State Department.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to me. Will he yield now?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman spoke with great irony of the secret sessions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the executive sessions. May I ask the gentleman whether or not his Appropriations Committee has executive sessions, and whether even Members of Congress may appear.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me tell the gentleman, every Member of Congress can read every word that transpires in a meeting of the Appropriations Committee. They are all printed, and you have seen them here 6 or 8 inches deep. Every word is taken down, and they are brought here so that every Member of Congress can read those hearings.

What have you got here on this important bill? You have got just these little, few pages, and it is admitted that most of the important evidence that you received does not appear. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] brought them in the other day.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield further. I have answered the gentleman's question. I have a few other things I should like to call to your attention about this bill.

Turn to the first page of the hearings and read the testimony of Will Clayton. What does he say? I quote him:

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry.

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry. I happen to have had the privilege, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama—

Mr. JARMAN. Do not address me if you will not yield to me.

Mr. KEEFE. I have already yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; but the gentleman declines to further yield when I asked him a question.

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman again.

Mr. JARMAN. I do not think it is fair for a gentleman to address another gentleman in this House and then decline to yield to him.

Mr. KEEFE. I have yielded to the gentleman. Does the gentleman want to say something more?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; I yield to the gentleman. Does he want to ask a question?

Mr. JARMAN. I repeat that a while ago the gentleman spoke with great irony of executive sessions. When I asked him whether the Appropriations Committee, his committee, has executive sessions, and whether it permits even Members of Congress not on the subcommittee concerned to attend, he switched off onto secret documents.

Mr. KEEFE. No; I did not switch off at all. I told the gentleman the facts, and he was so excited he did not pay any attention to them. He did not hear them.

The point I want to make is just this: Here is just a little bit of the record of what transpired. Does the gentleman concede that this is not the whole record of the evidence before his committee?

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I certainly do.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; that is all I wanted to say. Then, of course, you have some information that the rest of us do not have. But I am basing my opinion, may I say to the Members, on what is here, and this is enough.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Not right at this moment.

The UNRRA pipe lines will soon run dry.

I want to say to the gentleman that in another committee of this House I have heard the testimony with reference to the general relief proposals for money to take care of relief in occupied areas. I have heard a good deal about those pipe lines, and, being a realist, I want to talk about those pipe lines for just a moment.

You know, you cannot take \$350,000,000 or \$200,000,000 and go out and spend it overnight and start the pipe line running, and then take a spigot and turn it off.

Did it ever occur to you that it takes weeks to get this program under way and that it takes weeks to go into our markets and purchase the wheat and other supplies that you are going to ship over there and that it takes weeks to get the food on the ships and get the ships chartered and routed to those countries to which they are going? And, then, when the goods get over there, what happens

to it? What happens to this food after it gets there? Oh, you say, We are going to throw hedges around it. But when you take this food off the ships and you unload it, as you must, you say you are going to relieve Poland. Where does this food go? They have warehouses there. It goes into the warehouse. Then, after you get it there Joe Stalin says, Well, we are sorry, boys. We have the food over here but we cannot do it just that way. Supposing they do do things as your contract provides. Who gets the food? Who gets the wheat? Did anybody ask a question about that? You load a boat with wheat which has to be ground into flour. Who grinds it and who pays for the grinding? After it is ground into flour and is sacked, how does the wheat get to all these poor starving people that we hear about? How does it get into the bakeshops to be baked? Has anybody told you about that? You can read the record of these hearings. They are barren of a single word on that subject. It would be interesting to know that, would it not? If these people are so poor and emaciated and are suffering so from malnutrition and they cannot work and do anything, how are they able to buy this food? Is it given to them? Is it distributed as relief? How does it get to these poor people?

I will tell you how it gets to them from the evidence that came before my committee. They buy it and they buy it with the currency of the country that they live in. They pay for it in Polish currency or Austrian currency or Greek currency or whatever other country it might happen to be. And if a fellow does not have that currency, God help him. Then, who gets that currency? To whom does it go and what becomes of it? Has anybody told you about that? Well, it goes into our hands, but then what do we do with it? Does it have any value? In relation to the dollar, it does not have much value, but it is the medium of exchange of that country. Then, what do we do with it? We use it to buy more produce that is produced locally in those countries. Some time the thing is going to end. What becomes of the money that they collect? Is there a word in here about it? Not a word.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman mentioned relief in Poland and the distribution of relief. Did the gentleman hear General Drury when he gave his report on UNRRA relief and distribution in Poland? The report was made here in the Speaker's dining room and all of us were invited to hear it.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not happen to be invited, or at least I do not recall it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. General Drury told the group of Congressmen who were there to hear him, and there must have been at least 60 or 70 of us who heard the report, that he was very well pleased with the system of distribution. He told us that it was distributed on this basis. He said you did not give them a basket of relief supplies as you did here in the



United States under the WPA program. He said they had to work in order to get this food. Everyone who worked received food. You were able to buy it, but you got UNRRA relief supplies only if you worked. The only other class of people who received UNRRA relief supplies were the orphaned children, and the disabled and hospitalized, and sick people. No drones received any relief supplies. Those who did not work did not get any relief.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Let me call your attention to this language in the testimony of Mr. Clayton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. In describing what the agreements are between this country and the countries receiving our help, he says this:

Our agreements will be very comprehensive and will include methods, principles, and policies for the distribution of all supplies. The agreement would cover the question of ration systems that should be in effect in the country, and price controls. It would provide that there should be no discriminations, no export or diversion—

And so on and so forth. Now, UNRRA tried to get free access for radio and press into those countries that are dominated by communism. We tried to write such a provision in that bill the last time it was on the floor, providing there would be no distribution of UNRRA supplies in those countries that did not open up and let us see what took place. Do you think for a minute, speaking of the poor people of Poland, Yugoslavia, and those nations under the heel of communistic control—do you think that Mr. Stalin is going to open up those nations now and take down that iron curtain? If he does not, under the provisions of this bill, how are those poor people going to get any relief from these funds? Will you tell me that?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The American supplies went into Russia, into the hands of Communist Russia and were distributed, and the people were told that they were coming from Russia. No credit at all was given the United States.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in closing, if you go through this and analyze it step by step as to just what happened, yes, you can listen to some of these broad reports, but you get right down to it and you see how futile all these things are that we try to put around and hedge and protect this money. The safest thing to do is to see to it that we do not appropriate one dollar to be spent in those countries that are dominated by communistic countries or organizations. Then we are safe, and we do not need worry about it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman in favor of the Jonkman amendment?

Mr. KEEFE. I am heartily in favor of it. May I say I thoroughly agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] said. I was in hopes that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] could be so drawn that we could adopt the Jonkman amendment limiting the sum to \$2,000,000 and then set up a committee to see what the situation will be after this next crop year has come about.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman not agree that if the statement made on the floor a short while ago with respect to supplies being sent to Russia under lend-lease is true, then a colossal fraud is being perpetrated upon the people of the country.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is a fair statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise especially at this time to try, if I can, to defend the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think it is very unfortunate that any statement should be made on the floor of this House criticizing the committee for doing something that will permit them to legislate properly and to receive information by which no one will be embarrassed. Your chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], has done wonderful work in the time he has been there. It would be impossible to allow the testimony of witnesses called in executive session to go out. It just could not be done. But all of the testimony was taken by the official reporter, and any Member, I believe, has the right to go up there and read the testimony given at that time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I would prefer to make this statement if you will permit me. When you call an ambassador from a country to testify before the committee and that ambassador is going to return to his post in a few days, it would be very embarrassing if the testimony given by the ambassador were to be broadcast in such a way that he could not return to his post. You are withholding such testimony to protect yourself. If you want to get the real information, if you want to get the inside information, if you want to get everything he knows, if he is willing to give it to you, you cannot hold open sessions on an occasion of that kind; it is impossible to do it. But you have your 14 Republican members and you have your Democratic members and they get the evidence and the testimony that is necessary in order to legislate properly. I think every Member of the House, Mr. Chairman, ought to feel satisfied that the chairman and the members of the committee are doing the best they can under the circumstances.

It is not all foreign affairs, because you must remember that foreign affairs is 50 percent domestic affairs as well. It is very unfortunate to give out the impression that your committee is functioning in secret and nobody is supposed to know anything about this. It is not so.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing I wish to say. We are asking here for an authorization of \$350,000,000. This is predicated upon what the other members of the United Nations are going to give. The total amount is \$610,000,000. If we cut the authorization, and it is only an authorization, the members of the Appropriations Committee do not have to appropriate the full amount if they do not want to; they hold their hearings, they get whatever testimony they want to—if we cut the \$350,000,000 nearly 50 percent we are automatically going to cut the balance of the \$610,000,000 that we are looking for.

This is entirely different. I think those gentlemen who are bringing UNRRA into this legislative picture, Mr. Chairman, are not doing justice to the legislation we have before us. UNRRA was an entirely different thing. That was an international organization governed and controlled internationally, but this one is not. We said right in the beginning to the United Nations that we wanted to do this on our own, that we wanted to regulate everything.

The gentleman has asked how we are going to distribute the food. We will regulate every contract and every agreement entered into between these different countries; and it is not only for Europe, they have said nothing about China and I think China is going to take a great part of this. We do not know at this time really what is going to happen over there. They said, "Wait until we hear General Marshall's speech." General Marshall's speech tonight will not give you any information on which you can govern yourself in your vote on this legislative authorization in the House.

They say we must stop communism from spreading. We have to destroy communism in other parts of the world and we also have to destroy it in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Are you not going to create a worse condition by encouraging communism?

Mr. BLOOM. I will answer that; I am just as good a Christian as the gentleman is. I am not that kind of Christian. If I find a man starving in any part of the world I am not going to ask him what his religion is or what kind of politics he believes in. I will feed the starving and give them a helping hand wherever they are. You cannot fight communism with empty stomachs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 3 additional minutes, I want to ask him a question.

Mr. BLOOM. Two will be sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. If we go into these different countries—and I find there is nothing new about it, I have studied this thing for a long time, long before this war, and long after the first war. I have been through 3 wars; I know what we are going through; but I will say this, that we have to do this job here today and we have to feed these people at all costs, and it is not going to cost us more than this \$350,000,000. If we can give to the organization \$350,000,000 and let the other countries throughout the world know we are going to do this and go along with them and want them to go along with us, then we will have them with us. If I know someone is starving any place and if I can get food to them, if I can give them a helping hand, I do not care whether it is in New York, Washington, or where it is, I am going to try to do that.

Mr. RANKIN. The trouble is when you send this food into these Communist-dominated countries, the Communists take it and use it to suit themselves and let the Christian women and children starve to death.

Mr. BLOOM. It is up to us to make the rules and regulations so severe and make them so binding that the food will get to the starving people who need it. That is what ought to be done. We have everything to say in the matter. We hold the whip hand from beginning to end.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman sure he was accurate in the statement he made that this is conditioned upon participation by any other government?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; I did not say that. If I said that, I was in error.

Mr. COX. The gentleman used the word "dependent." That is not correct then?

Mr. BLOOM. It is dependent in this way, if you use the word "dependent." I will admit that I did say that. There is a certain percentage of the different countries that will give a certain amount of money. The total sum is \$610,000,000 of which our share it is stated we are going to give is \$350,000,000.

Mr. COX. It is proposed that we donate \$350,000,000 whether any other country gives a dime or not?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, yes; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one additional minute because I want to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. I have great confidence in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I

want to see the people of Poland and these other nations helped, but I am very doubtful about one question that concerns an amendment I have at the desk. Does the gentleman from New York feel this gift of \$350,000,000 is necessary for our common defense and general welfare?

Mr. BLOOM. For both and be sure that I said "for both." There is nothing stronger than the truth and that is the truth, sir.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I wonder if my friend can give the House any definite information concerning the statement made a moment ago to the effect that we are now shipping heavy equipment to Russia under UNRRA?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman's question, of course that is aside from the bill we have under consideration, but let me say that Russia owes us under lend-lease about ten or eleven billion dollars. We have been trying to get some kind of answer from them, but they have not answered until just the other day. UNRRA has a contract with Russia. There are a few businessmen in this House and they will see the situation we are in. We have a contract. We have agreed to give, sell, or allow Russia to buy a certain amount of goods. This is a contract. Now, the United States does not fulfill her part of the contract. Let me tell you, Mr. RANKIN, about this. Listen, because this is good for you.

Mr. RANKIN. I will hear you.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman cannot feel any worse toward those people over there than I do, but they are a shrewd people. If we default on our contract, well, Mr. Soviet Russia will sit back and say, "When you fulfill your part of the contract we will talk to you."

Unfortunately we are in the position that if we do, well, we are dashed, and if we do not, we are dashed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how many Members desire to speak further on this amendment, so that we can get some idea as to when we can conclude.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Which amendment does the gentleman refer to? There are two amendments pending.

Mr. EATON. This amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 12 Members in addition to the chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. You cannot possibly finish this bill tonight. Why not carry it over until tomorrow? As I said, we want to hear General Marshall tonight, and I want every Member to read the story in the Reader's Digest before he votes tomorrow on this proposition.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the Committee rise at 5 o'clock because of other committee engagements that we have, so that a half hour from now we will rise. I do not see how we can vote on this bill tonight intelligently.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What is the parliamentary situation at the moment?

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending an amendment and a substitute therefor offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. A further parliamentary inquiry. That does not preclude other amendments to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EATON) there were—ayes 73, noes 56.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to clear up any possible misunderstanding that may have arisen from the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota in regard to the President's request for relief funds this year. Bear in mind that the \$100,000,000 referred to by the gentleman from South Dakota was a \$100,000,000 estimate by President Truman to carry on relief expenditures for the balance of the fiscal year 1947. The \$350,000,000 provided for here is estimated to be used up by the end of the calendar year 1947, that is, to January 1948. It is entirely possible that there will be some slip-over for the delivery of some of these supplies into January and February 1948. I just wanted to make this absolutely clear.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, inasmuch as he has been referring to my remarks?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I refer the gentleman and my colleagues to the testimony at



the top of page 84, where Mr. Wood, who spoke for the State Department all through these hearings, said specifically that in this amount of \$350,000,000, \$100,000,000 would be spent in the fiscal year of 1947 and \$250,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948; so there should not be any argument about that. It is printed in the hearings at the top of page 84.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman's quotations are correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Gentlemen, I speak not for the committee which needs no defense in view of the distinguished character and great reputation for public service of the chairman and many of the members who are far senior to me, including the ranking minority member, but because I think no word has been spoken here this afternoon about the people who are waiting for this relief. We are talking about \$350,000,000 which sounds like a great deal of money. But let us realize that in Greece alone there are 7,000,000 people. I was in Greece. I personally saw the situation there. Just as these distinguished gentlemen tell you that they personally saw the situation in Germany, to which we are contributing no money in this bill—let us get that perfectly clear—I want to tell you what I saw in Greece. The roads are torn up and the railroads are torn up. There is no rolling stock on the railroads. The farms are denuded of the equipment with which to cultivate crops. The situation generally is a shambles. If the Greek people did not have this relief from us to look forward to, it has been said and said truly that their despair would drive them into the arms of communism, not tomorrow, but today.

We must send them this help so that these people can fight against communism. Remember that communism is an idea—a conviction. It is not anything that you can exercise with bayonets. It is only the faith of these people that the democracies have a heart and that the democracies will come to the aid of those countries that are starving and that the democracies will not let them starve, that keeps these people from turning to communism. The Communists tell them that we will let them starve and that we are so selfish, so money-mad, so generally egotistical and set on maintaining our own standard of living, which incidentally is two or three times theirs, that we will let them starve. The greatest thing in the world for communism is this debate taking place on the floor of the House today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. I have read the committee's report very very carefully. I heartily endorse the position taken by a majority of the members on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, both Democratic and Republican. It is unfortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who preceded me had so little time to speak against the amend-

ment. Therefore, I should like to inter-rogate the gentleman from New York if he will submit himself to questioning.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that \$50,000,000 of this sum will go to Greece for food and medicine?

Mr. JAVITS. \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000. If I may have a little more of your time, I am so grateful to you for giving me a little more time, I had started to say that we were fact-finders. The facts are in the Record regardless of what has been said here to the contrary. I most respectfully ask the Members to turn to pages 107 and 108 of the record in which we have the testimony of a man by the name of FitzGerald. Mr. FitzGerald is a technician and adviser to former President Hoover in all of these things. He is the Secretary-General of the International Emergency Food Council on leave from the United States Department of Agriculture. FitzGerald said it would cost \$296,000,000 to acquire the elementary food and not anything else just this year. That is \$296,000,000. Those are the facts and negates completely this argument about the \$200,000,000 which with all due deference is made not by the friends of this bill but by those who feel that while they cannot defeat it at least they will cut it down so that it means nothing.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. And is it not true that this fifty or sixty million dollars for food and medicine lays the foundation for the bill which is to come before us relating to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. JAVITS. Without that we might just as well forget about the bill. We can not save dead men from communism.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that in Italy alone between \$100,000,000 and \$150,000,000 is to be spent from this relief fund?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. So the relief money necessary for Italy and Greece as contemplated under this bill exceeds the amount of \$200,000,000?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. If this present amendment is adopted, it is crystal clear to me that it may deprive the United States and other countries functioning through the United Nations from giving adequate relief to the starving millions of men, women, and children in China, Poland, Hungary, and Austria. The hope of the people of these nations must be sustained by our unselfish action during the remainder of this year and through 1948. It is hoped by that time that they will have sufficient economic strength to stand on their own feet. At this time they are prostrate, flat on their backs, and we must do everything possible to help them regain their balance. If we do not do so, starvation, disease, and terrorism will take over. I shall vote against the present amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jonkman amendment.

The record before us is absolutely void of any showing that even \$200,000,000 will be spent between now and harvest time of 1947.

As I said the other day, this is another blank-check proposition. We are asked to go along. If I am any judge of the sentiment that is exhibited in this House this afternoon, it is because our people are concerned about it. Our people are for no more blank checks. How did this figure of \$350,000,000 come to be born? On page 81 of the hearings the State Department said:

This figure of \$350,000,000 was in some respects a figure based on judgment, and, in part, picked out of the air.

Picked out of the air by the State Department, based upon a survey that had been made by an agency of the United Nations Organization. In addition to the statement I have made—that they cannot spend \$200,000,000 for the rest of the year—secondly, there has been no assurance that this relief is going to get down to the grass roots. How is it going to be done? Just as my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, it is going to get down to the grass roots by selling it to those people through the ordinary method of sales—through retail stores. I cannot conceive of a lot of those poor people who need this relief getting it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has said it all in a few words. You cannot save dead men from communism.

I am opposed to the present amendment. I am particularly opposed to the Colmer amendments that will be offered later. The Colmer amendments would deny bread, aid, and assistance to the Polish people. I want to repeat, we have had so many congressional committees go to Europe and see conditions in Europe, but how many of you have been in Poland? How many Members of the House have seen Poland? I doubt whether three of you have seen conditions in Poland, yet here is a country that was most devastated; whose people have suffered most; where the Nazis and the Russians both did their damndest. The Colmer amendments would deny to those people aid and assistance. Then, surely Hitler was right. Hitler would have won this war. We cannot—we must not—listen to that sort of reasoning or logic. Remember this: Germany on three or four different occasions has tried to swallow Poland, and did swallow it. Remember that Russia on three or four occasions in history has swallowed Poland and the Polish people. Remember that each time they had to vomit that country up again. They never could digest Poland or the Polish people. They are a Christian people, a liberty-loving people. They are not Communists. Everyone who has been in Poland will tell you there are less Communists in Poland than there are in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 153, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Lithuanian Society of Luzerne County.

Mr. CHADWICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks with reference to one of the bills discussed today.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Evening Bulletin of today's date entitled "No Somersault."

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT PROGRAM RELATING TO IDENTIFICATION OF UNKNOWN DEAD

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the press of postwar problems with which we must deal each day tends to obscure the actual price of victory paid for by our armed forces in the field with human lives.

But while we go on in our efforts to shape the sort of world for which more than 300,000 Americans gave their lives, it is heartening to note that we have not forgotten our honored dead and the next of kin who gave their sons into the service when our country was attacked.

Today the Office of the Quartermaster General is actively engaged in determining where the next of kin of all identified American World War II dead who now rest in cemeteries overseas want their loved ones to be finally buried.

The War Department is pledged to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin. In order to carry out this pledge, personnel of the American Graves Registration Service, of which the Quartermaster General of the Army, T. B. Larkin, is chief, have been at work throughout the world, wherever our troops fought and died. To them has fallen the solemn duty of recovering remains, making positive identification, and reverently interring the remains in temporary United

States military cemeteries until such time as the next of kin make decision as to final burial.

Last year I introduced a bill which became a law and which provides for the return to the United States of an unknown American member of the Armed Forces who will be buried in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., near or beside the remains of the Unknown Soldier of World War I. But the American Graves Registration Service is performing a noble and necessary work in taking every possible step to identify as many Americans who lost their lives overseas as is humanly possible.

The next of kin and relatives of our World War II dead should find some measure of comfort and solace in knowledge of the great care with which the remains of these honored dead are being treated, the pledge of the War Department to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin, and the promise that no remains will be identified unless that identity is established beyond the shadow of any possible doubt.

In the wake of war in the Pacific, personnel of the American Graves Registration Service disinterred the remains of some 1,600 Americans who had been buried in the prisoner of war cemetery at Camp O'Donnell on Luzon, P. I. These remains were reburied in a temporary United States military cemetery at Manila.

But of these 1,600 remains, approximately 800 were in an unidentified status.

Today it is gratifying to me to report that the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General, where the Government's program relating to our military dead is being capably and ably directed by Brig. Gen. George A. Horkan, has identified 642 of these unknown Americans after approximately 9 months of careful, painstaking work. Letters have gone out to next of kin of these identified informing them that positive identification has been made and that soon they will be able to make the decision as to where final burial of their loved one shall be made.

This is typical, Mr. President, of the efficient work being done by the Quartermaster Corps today in carrying out one of the most solemn postwar tasks ever assigned to the War Department—the return and final burial of our World War II dead.

Identification work is one of the most important and vital aspects of this return and final burial program, for the War Department has given its pledge that no next of kin will receive the remains other than those to which he is entitled, and all identification will be positive beyond any question whatsoever.

In the case of these deceased prisoners of the Japanese who were buried at Camp O'Donnell, identification was based upon a number of facts. Reports of death and reports of interments were compared. An officer's diary and casualty reports were carefully studied. Finally, dental charts were compared and authenticated by an expert in tooth-chart identification.

All of this information was then studied by an identification board of Army officers, and certification as to identification was not made until all were satisfied that the case histories left no doubt as to the separate identities of the individuals involved.

Present plans call for the disinterment and reprocessing of all remains from the Camp O'Donnell cemetery that are still in an unidentified status in an attempt to obtain new dental charts, if possible, and additional identifying media. This is in keeping with the policy of the American Graves Registration Service regarding unknowns. That is, no case of an unknown will ever be considered closed. A constant effort will go on, through the years, to locate evidence and information which will eventually result in sufficient accumulation of evidence to warrant identification.

I have gone into detail about the unknowns from the Camp O'Donnell prisoner-of-war cemetery because the work done by the American Graves Registration people and the personnel working in the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General here in Washington was so extensive. But every individual case of an unknown is given just as much attention and study as was given this large number of unknowns.

As our troops fought from one area to another throughout the world during World War II, Graves Registration units went about the sorrowful task of interring our dead in the temporary United States military cemeteries which were established.

In most cases identity of the dead was positively established through the identification tags which each man wore, through personal papers found on the remains, or through laundry marks which were on the clothing of the deceased.

Where remains could not be identified personnel experts in identification processes have been working for the American Graves Registration Commands in an effort to establish identity. Every useful device known to modern science and every skill needed in detection work has been made available so that the number of unknowns will be reduced to an absolute minimum. Every bit of evidence connected with any unknown remains is scrutinized carefully and subjected to searching analysis. Use of the fluoroscope has been particularly successful in discovering metallic objects within the remains which might lead to positive identification. Anthropological methods have been employed. In using this science, actual bone measurements are made. From these, with the help of scientific tables, it is possible to determine race, sex, and age. In this way leads are obtained which help toward the eventual establishment of an individual's identity.

Some of the stories of identification work being done today by American Graves Registration Service personnel in the field and by personnel in the Office of the Quartermaster General here in Washington rival the most unusual tales set down by writers of fiction. In several cases Quartermaster Corps identification personnel have spent several months



tracing down ownership of rings or bracelets found on unidentified remains. Working with only this type of clue to start with, they have carried on the task of identifying an individual, step by step, until the entire case has been completed and presented overwhelming evidence that the remains could be positively identified as those of a particular soldier, sailor, marine, or coast guardsman.

This is no impersonal, cut and dried type of assignment which the Office of the Quartermaster General and the American Graves Registration Service are carrying on. It must be conducted always with the thought in mind that somewhere the next of kin and relatives of men who gave their lives on the field of battle are hoping that the remains will be found and properly identified.

You are all familiar with the name of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., Air Corps, who died December 10, 1941, in the Philippine Islands following a bombing operation which won for him posthumous award of the Distinguished Service Cross. Captain Kelly was buried for more than four and a half years as an unknown until American Graves Registration Service personnel, after careful study of a great deal of accumulated evidence, was able to make positive identification.

Captain Kelly, you may recall, was one of an eight-man crew in a B-17 aircraft which went out on a mission of bombing Japanese naval units. The aircraft crashed about 5 miles east of Clark Field on Luzon, P. I., while returning from the mission.

Now, six men of this eight-man crew bailed out. The remains which eventually were identified as those of Captain Kelly were found near the body of a Brooklyn, N. Y., sergeant. The sergeant was identified through identification tags found on his body. But there were no identification tags on Captain Kelly's remains. And Graves Registration officers would not make identification on flimsy evidence.

So Captain Kelly's remains were buried first on Luzon and subsequently were reburied, as unknown, in the United States Military Cemetery, Manila No. 2, at Manila, P. I. Accelerated progress of the war made it impossible to conduct a complete investigation at the time.

With the coming of peace in the Pacific, identification data supplied by American Graves Registration Command personnel in the Philippine Islands was compared with records made during Captain Kelly's service in this country after he had been graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. It was on the basis of positive evidence only that identification of this hero was ultimately made.

As of February 28, 1947, the Memorial Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General estimated that there were a total of 294,690 remains in all overseas theaters. Of this number, a total of 251,186 had been identified and 43,504 were unidentified. Of 294,690 estimated remains of World War II dead buried overseas, a total of 269,044 were in United States military, Allied or civilian cemeteries, or isolated locations. And of this number, 251,186 had been

identified as of that date. The War Department is confident that many more identifications will be made in the months which are ahead.

All next of kin of identified personnel have already received a letter from General Larkin setting forth the cemetery and the plot, row, and grave number within that cemetery overseas where their loved one is interred. And work has already been started on sending to each next of kin of an identified member of the armed forces who died overseas and who is now buried in one of our temporary United States military cemeteries a photographic reproduction of that cemetery.

There has been some talk in the press recently to the effect that these honored dead should remain in the lands where they fought and died and are now buried, and that they should not be brought back to the United States.

But I feel that the War Department is carrying out this program for return and final burial in a most democratic manner, in the fairest possible way. It is leaving this decision entirely up to each individual next of kin.

The Office of the Quartermaster General has started to send to each next of kin a letter containing complete information about this return and final burial program. That letter contains a form on which next of kin will designate where they wish final burial of a loved one to be made. That form, in turn, is sent back to the Office of the Quartermaster General, where steps will be taken to carry out all feasible wishes of the next of kin.

Next of kin may decide to have the remains returned to the United States for burial in a private cemetery; returned to the United States for burial in a national cemetery; buried in a permanent American military cemetery overseas or buried in a private cemetery in a foreign country which is the homeland of the deceased or the next of kin.

If next of kin ask that remains be returned to the United States for burial in a private cemetery, the remains will be sent to the point designated, all expenses paid, with a military escort.

It is fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, that we go to these lengths with our honored dead of World War II. By carrying out the wishes of the next of kin we are, in some respects, paying back to these good people throughout the land a debt incurred when we asked them to give us their sons for military duty.

No matter what decision next of kin may make, they may be assured that if the Office of the Quartermaster General has written to them concerning the remains of a loved one, that the remains are those to which they are entitled. There can be no question whatsoever as to the identification which has been made.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, for April 28, 29, and 30, on account of official business.

To Mrs. NORTON, for April 29 and 30 and May 1, on account of official business.

To Mr. PRESTON, for April 28, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 29, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

605. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

606. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

607. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the allowance of leave credit to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof, who were denied such credit as the result of certain changes in their status between September 8, 1939, and August 9, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

608. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a final report of the operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Office of Small Business, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

609. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a printed copy of the Annual Report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

610. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3203. A bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 383, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 1179. A bill to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 196. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee

on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 319). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 197. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 320). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 198. Resolution providing that the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118 and House Resolution 135 of the Eightieth Congress shall be effective from February 13, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 321). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Finance additional copies of Senate Report No. 610, Seventy-sixth Congress, entitled "Survey of Experience in Profit Sharing and Possibilities of Incentive Taxation"; without amendment (Rept. No. 322). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3227. A bill to provide for inactive duty training pay for the Organized Reserve Corps, to provide uniform standards for inactive duty training pay for all Reserve components of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3228. A bill granting the same income tax treatment to married persons living in non-community-property States as is now allowed to married persons living in community-property States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3229. A bill to repeal the act of April 29, 1902, relating to the procurement of statistics of trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3230. A bill to provide a method of paying referees in those bankruptcy courts where the existing funds are insufficient to pay sums due such referees for services rendered and expenses incurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 3231. A bill to provide for old-age assistance payments to the States with respect to needy individuals who are voluntary inmates of public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 3232. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 3233. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3234. A bill relating to the acquisition of civil-service status by certain war-service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 3235. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3236. A bill to provide for the preparation and distribution of booklets of information relating to Members of, and Delegates to, and the Resident Commissioner in, the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3237. A bill to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures without any or further proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to alter or modify their financial obligations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3238. A bill to secure prompt payment and adjustment of just claims for loss of or damage to property received by laundries and dry-cleaning and dyeing establishments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3239. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3240. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to extend the same provisions of said act to officers of World War II, and to add the Legion of Merit and Silver Star to those decorations cited in the act of June 13, 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the extraordinary disaster at Higgins and Glazier, Tex.; Woodward, Okla.; and surrounding areas; and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the Baruch plan for the international control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, amending chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, relating to revenue bonds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taxation and expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to migratory game birds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will permit the use of decommissioned hospital ships by State and city agencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging investigation and settlement of the question of Indian or aboriginal title to all lands in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to survey of the fishery possibilities of the Bering Sea in the Nome area; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to protest the closing of the Twin Cities Arsenal at New Brighton, Minn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for an examination and study to preserve a reasonable price balance; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient hunters to kill and exterminate all predatory animals such as cougars, wildcats, wolves, and coyotes in the national parks in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide funds from which grants may be made for the assistance of the school systems; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to raise the amount of personal exemptions on Federal taxation of incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEWART:

H. R. 3241. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Margaret Pickett Yellowtail; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3242. A bill for the relief of Dora M. Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 3243. A bill for the relief of Roman Toporow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 3244. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

380. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 33 residents of Lawrence County, Pa., urging liberalized benefits for veterans under the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.



381. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the State of Maine, that Congress request the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to review the present methods employed in determining conditions under which soft-shell-clam-producing areas are closed to the taking of all shellfish that go into interstate commerce, and that the study be made with the least possible delay in order to relieve the serious consequences now resulting from restrictions currently in force that hinder the complete utilization of the shellfish resources of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

382. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of Washington State Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors with attached resolutions of Washington Wool Growers' Association and National Wool Growers' Association, commending Soil Conservation Service and its accomplishments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

383. Also, petition of the State of Washington, to set aside the area of old Fort Vancouver as a national monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

384. Also, memorial of the State of Washington, to provide hunters for extermination of predatory animals in national parks; to the Committee on Public Lands.

385. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mrs. Jesse Tanner and 28 other residents of St. John, Kans., urging the enactment of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

386. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, respectfully presenting and petitioning that Congress request the Surgeon General review present methods employed in determining conditions under which soft-shell-clam-producing areas are closed to the taking of all shellfish that go into interstate commerce; that the review be made with the least possible delay to relieve the serious consequences; that the review complete whether or not the methods of determining the sanitation of soft-shell clams and the areas involved should not be different from those used in the examination of oysters and oyster beds; and that the test shall be made by testing the clam and not by testing the water; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

387. By the SPEAKER: Petition of San Juan Bautista Council, No. 1543, Knights of Columbus, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension to Puerto Rico of all legislation that may be approved against communism; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

388. Also, petition of the Free Sons of Israel, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support of H. R. 2910 and promotion of its enactment into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

389. Also, petition of American Association of Social Workers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of legislation to permit admission of displaced persons into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

390. Also, petition of the Atlantic City Board of Trade, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the bills S. 866 and H. R. 2523; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

391. Also, petition of the delegates from the Townsend clubs of the Second Congressional District of the State of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

392. Also, petition of membership of the Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

393. Also, petition of the New Port Richey Townsend Club, No. 1, of Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Give us open eyes, our Father, to see the beauty all around us and to see in it Thy handiwork. Let all lovely things fill us with gladness and let them lift up our hearts in true worship.

Give us this day, O God, a strong and vivid sense that Thou art by our side. By Thy grace, let us go nowhere this day where Thou canst not come nor court any companionship that would rob us of Thine. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 28, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 28, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1009) to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### "House Concurrent Resolution 33

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-fourth session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide that whenever 25 or more persons holding an honorable discharge from service, during the present war, in the armed forces of the United States or from service, during the present war, in the merchant marine who were residents of Hawaii for a continuous period of not less than 5 years immediately prior to entry into such service, who have not theretofore made application under such organic act, shall make written application to the commissioner of public lands for the opening of agricultural lands for settlement in any locality or district, it shall be the duty of said commissioner to proceed expeditiously to survey and open for entry agricultural lands, whether unoccupied or under lease with the right of withdrawal, sufficient in area to provide lands for use and occupancy upon 99-year lease, by such persons, together with all persons of like qualification who shall have filed with such commissioner prior to the survey of such lands, written applications for lands for occupancy in the district designated in said applications, of 4 acres each. The land to be so opened by said commissioner shall be either the specific tract or tracts applied for or other suitable and available agricultural lands in the same geographical district, and, as far as possible, in the immediate locality of and as nearly equal to that applied for as may be available: *Provided, however*, That no leased land under cultivation shall be taken for homesteading until any crops growing thereon shall have been harvested: *And provided further*, That each lease made under such enactment shall be deemed subject to the following conditions, whether or not stipulated in the lease:

"(1) The lessee shall pay a rental of \$1 a year for the land and the lease shall be for a term of 99 years.

"(2) The lessee shall occupy and commence to use or cultivate the land as his home or farm within 1 year after the lease is made, and shall continuously so use and cultivate said land during the entire term of the lease.

"(3) The lessee shall not in any manner transfer to nor mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold for the benefit of any other person, or agree so to transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise hold, his interest in the land. Such interest shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or sale upon court process. Upon the death of the lessee his interest in the land and improvements thereon shall vest as follows:

"(a) In his widow, if he leave a widow;

"(b) If he leave no widow, in such child or children of his as he may designate by will, or upon failure of such designation, in his children in joint tenancy;

"(c) In the event that he leave no widow or children, the right to the use and occupancy of said land shall thereupon revert in the Territory.

"(4) The lessee shall pay all taxes assessed upon the land and improvements thereon